arXiv:1101.5982v3 [math.CT] 21 Mar 2011

IDEALS OF TAMBARA FUNCTORS

HIROYUKI NAKAOKA

ABSTRACT. For a finite group G, a Tambara functor on G is regarded as a G-bivariant analog of a commutative ring. In this article, we consider a G-bivariant analog of the ideal theory for Tambara functors.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and Preliminaries 1
2. Definition and fundamental properties 5
2.1. Definition of an ideal 5
3. Operations on ideals 9
3.1. Intersection of ideals 9
3.2. Some remarks on Noetherian property 11
3.3. Product of ideals 12
3.4. Sum of ideals 15
4. Prime ideals 17
4.1. Definition of a prime ideal 17
4.2. Spectrum of a Tambara functor 18
4.3. Monomorphic restriction condition 23
4.4. Domains and fields 29
References 35

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

For a finite group G, a Tambara functor is regarded as a G-bivariant analog of a commutative ring, as seen in [9]. As such, for example a G-bivariant analog of the semigroup-ring construction was discussed in [3] and [4], with relation to the Dress construction [5]. As part of this analogy, in this article we consider a G-bivariant analog of the ideal theory for Tambara functors.

In section 2, we define an ideal of a Tambara functor, and show the fundamental theorem on homomorphisms for Tambara functors (Proposition 2.10, Remark 2.11).

In section 3, we perform some operations on ideals (intersections, products, and sums), and show that an analog of the Chinese remainder theorem holds for any Tambara functor (Corollary 3.19).

In section 4, we define a prime ideal of a Tambara functor, and construct the prime spectrum of a Tambara functor (Proposition 4.8 and Theorem 4.9). We may

---

The author wishes to thank Professor Fumihito Oda for his suggestions and useful comments.

The author wishes to thank Professor Serge Bouc and Professor Radu Stancu for the stimulating arguments and their useful comments and advices.

Supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 22740005.

define an analog of an integral domain (resp. a field), by requiring the zero-ideal $(0) \subsetneq T$ is prime (resp. maximal). We give a criterion for a Tambara functor to be a 'field' (Theorem 4.32), and show that the Burnside Tambara functor Ω is an 'integral domain' (Theorem 4.40).

In section 4 we also show that any Tambara functor has a canonical ideal quotient, contained in a fixed point functor (Theorem 4.24). For example, this canonical quotient obtained from Ω becomes isomorphic to the fixed point functor associated to $\mathbb{Z}$ (Example 4.25).

Throughout this article, we fix a finite group G, whose unit element is denoted by e. Abbreviately we denote the trivial subgroup of G by e, instead of $\{e\}$. $H \leq G$ means H is a subgroup of G. ${}_G set$ denotes the category of finite G-sets and G-equivariant maps. If $H \leq G$ and $g \in G$, then H^g denotes the conjugate $H^g = g^{-1}Hg$.

A monoid is always assumed to be unitary and commutative. Similarly a ring is assumed to be commutative, with an additive unit 0 and a multiplicative unit 1. We denote the category of monoids by *Mon*, the category of rings by *Ring*. A monoid homomorphism preserves units, and a ring homomorphism preserves 0 and 1.

For any category $\mathscr{C}$ and any pair of objects X and Y in $\mathscr{C}$, the set of morphisms from X to Y in $\mathscr{C}$ is denoted by $\mathscr{C}(X,Y)$.

First we briefly recall the definition of a Tambara functor.

Definition 1.1. A *Tambara functor T on G* is a triplet $T = (T^*, T_+, T_\bullet)$ of two covariant functors

$$T_+ \colon {}_G set \to Set, \quad T_\bullet \colon {}_G set \to Set$$

and one contravariant functor

$$T^* \colon {}_G set \to Set$$

which satisfies the following. Here *Set* is the category of sets.

(1) $T^\alpha = (T^*, T_+)$ is a Mackey functor on G.
(2) $T^\mu = (T^*, T_\bullet)$ is a semi-Mackey functor on G.
Since T^α, T^μ are semi-Mackey functors, we have $T^*(X) = T_+(X) = T_\bullet(X)$ for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. We denote this by $T(X)$.
(3) (Distributive law) If we are given an exponential diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X & A \arrow[l, "p"'] & Z \arrow[l, "\lambda"'] \\ Y \arrow[from=1-1, "f"'] & \arrow[phantom, u, "exp"] & B \arrow[from=1-3, "\rho"] \arrow[ll, "q"] \end{tikzcd}$$

in ${}_G set$, then

$$\begin{tikzcd} T(X) \arrow[d, "T_\bullet(f)"'] & T(A) \arrow[l, "T_+(p)"'] \arrow[r, "T^*(\lambda)"] & T(Z) \arrow[d, "T_\bullet(\rho)"] \\ T(Y) & \circlearrowleft & T(B) \arrow[ll, "T_+(q)"] \end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

If $T = (T^*, T_+, T_\bullet)$ is a Tambara functor, then $T(X)$ becomes a ring for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, whose additive (resp. multiplicative) structure is induced from that on $T^\alpha(X)$ (resp. $T^\mu(X)$). Those $T^*(f), T_+(f), T_\bullet(f)$ for morphisms f in ${}_G set$ are called *structure morphisms* of T. For each $f \in {}_G set(X,Y)$,

- $T^*(f)\colon T(Y) \to T(X)$ is a ring homomorphism, called the *restriction* along f.
- $T_+(f)\colon T(X) \to T(Y)$ is an additive homomorphism, called the *additive transfer* along f.
- $T_\bullet(f)\colon T(X) \to T(Y)$ is a multiplicative homomorphism, called the *multiplicative transfer* along f.

$T^*(f), T_+(f), T_\bullet(f)$ are often abbreviated to $f^*, f_+, f_\bullet$.

A *morphism* of Tambara functors $\varphi\colon T \to S$ is a family of ring homomorphisms

$$\varphi = \{\varphi_X : T(X) \to S(X)\}_{X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)},$$

natural with respect to all of the contravariant and the covariant parts. We denote the category of Tambara functors by $Tam(G)$.

Remark that if $f \in {}_G set(X,Y)$ is a G-map between transitive G-sets X and Y, then the number of elements in a fiber of f

$$\sharp f^{-1}(y) = \sharp\{x \in X \mid f(x) = y\}$$

does not depend on $y \in Y$. This is called the *degree* of f, and denoted by $\deg f$.

Definition 1.2. A Tambara functor T is *additively cohomological* if T^α is cohomological as a Mackey functor ([1]), namely, if for any $f \in {}_G set(X,Y)$ between transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$,

$$f_+ f^*(b) = (\deg f)\, b \quad ({}^\forall b \in T(Y))$$

is satisfied.

In this article, a *Tambara functor* always means a Tambara functor on G.

Example 1.3.

(1) If we define Ω by

$$\Omega(X) = K_0({}_G set/X)$$

for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, where the right hand side is the Grothendieck ring of the category of finite G-sets over X, then Ω becomes a Tambara functor on G. This is called the *Burnside Tambara functor*. For each $f \in {}_G set(X,Y)$,

$$f_\bullet\colon \Omega(X) \to \Omega(Y)$$

is the one determined by

$$f_\bullet(A \xrightarrow{p} X) = (\Pi_f(A) \xrightarrow{\pi} Y) \qquad ({}^\forall(A \xrightarrow{p} X) \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set/X)),$$

where $\Pi_f(A)$ and π is

$$\Pi_f(A) = \left\{ (y,\sigma) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} y \in Y, \\ \sigma\colon f^{-1}(y) \to A \ \text{ a map of sets}, \\ p \circ \sigma = \mathrm{id}_{f^{-1}(y)} \end{array} \right\},$$

$$\pi(y,\sigma) = y.$$

G acts on $\Pi_f(A)$ by $g \cdot (y, \sigma) = (gy, {}^g\sigma)$, where ${}^g\sigma$ is the map defined by

$${}^g\sigma(x) = g\sigma(g^{-1}x) \quad ({}^\forall x \in f^{-1}(gy)).$$

(2) Let R be a G-ring. If we define $\mathcal{P}_R$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_R(X) = \{G\text{-maps from } X \text{ to } R\}$$

for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, then $\mathcal{P}_R$ becomes a Tambara functor on G. This is called the *fixed point functor* associated to R.

For the properties of exponential diagrams, see [6]. Here we only introduce the following.

Remark 1.4. Let $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$ be any morphism, and let $\nabla \colon X \amalg X \to X$ be the folding map. Then

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[d, "f"'] & X \amalg X \arrow[l, "\nabla"'] \arrow[d, phantom, "exp"] & U \amalg U' \arrow[l, "r \amalg r'"'] \arrow[d, "t \cup t'"] \\
Y & & V \arrow[ll, "s"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
V & = & \{(y, C) \mid y \in Y,\ C \subseteq f^{-1}(y)\}, \\
U & = & \{(x, C) \mid x \in X,\ C \subseteq f^{-1}(f(x)),\ x \in C\}, \\
U' & = & \{(x, C) \mid x \in X,\ C \subseteq f^{-1}(f(x)),\ x \notin C\},
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
r \colon U \to X & , & (x, C) \mapsto x, \\
r' \colon U' \to X & , & (x, C) \mapsto x, \\
t \colon U \to V & , & (x, C) \mapsto (f(x), C), \\
t' \colon U' \to V & , & (x, C) \mapsto (f(x), C), \\
s \colon V \to Y & , & (y, C) \mapsto y,
\end{array}$$

is an exponential diagram.

Any Tambara functor satisfies the following properties, which will be frequently used in this article.

Fact 1.5. ([6]) Let T be a Tambara functor.

(1) For any G-map $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$, if we let η be the inclusion

$$\eta \colon Y \setminus f(X) \hookrightarrow Y,$$

then we have $f_\bullet(0) = \eta_+(1)$.

(2) (Projection formula) For any $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$, $a \in T(X)$ and $b \in T(Y)$, we have

$$f_+(af^*(b)) = f_+(a)b.$$

(3) (Addition formula) For any $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$, in the notation of Remark 1.4, we have

$$f_\bullet(a + b) = s_+(t_\bullet r^*(a) \cdot t'_\bullet r'^*(b))$$

for any $a, b \in T(X)$.

2. Definition and fundamental properties

2.1. Definition of an ideal.

Definition 2.1. Let T be a Tambara functor. An *ideal* $\mathscr{I}$ of T is a family of ideals $\mathscr{I}(X) \subseteq T(X)$ $({}^{\forall}X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set))$ satisfying

(i) $f^*(\mathscr{I}(Y)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(X)$,
(ii) $f_+(\mathscr{I}(X)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(Y)$,
(iii) $f_\bullet(\mathscr{I}(X)) \subseteq f_\bullet(0) + \mathscr{I}(Y)$

for any $f \in {}_{G}set(X, Y)$. These conditions also imply

$$\mathscr{I}(X_1 \amalg X_2) \cong \mathscr{I}(X_1) \times \mathscr{I}(X_2)$$

for any $X_1, X_2 \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set)$.

Obviously when G is trivial, this definition of an ideal agrees with the ordinary definition of an ideal of a commutative ring.

Remark 2.2. Let T be a Tambara functor. For any ideal $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$, we have $\mathscr{I}(\emptyset) = T(\emptyset) = 0$.

Example 2.3. Trivial examples of ideals are the following.

(1) $\mathscr{I} = T$ is an ideal of T. Often we except this trivial one.
(2) If we let $\mathscr{I}(X) = 0$ for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set)$, then $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ is an ideal. This is called the *zero ideal* and denoted by (0).

If T is a Tambara functor, then T^α becomes a Green functor, with the cross product defined by

$$cr\colon T^\alpha(X) \times T^\alpha(Y) \to T^\alpha(X \times Y)\ ;\ (x, y) \mapsto p_X^*(x) \cdot p_Y^*(y)$$

for any $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set)$. (See [7] or [3].)

With this underlying Green functor structure, an ideal $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ gives a *functorial ideal* $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T^\alpha$. A functorial ideal is originally defined in [8], and written in the following form using the cross product in [2].

Definition 2.4. Let A be a Green functor on G. A *functorial ideal* $\mathscr{I}$ of A is a Mackey subfunctor $\mathscr{I} \subseteq A$, satisfying

$$cr(\mathscr{I}(X) \times A(Y)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(X \times Y)$$
$$cr(A(X) \times \mathscr{I}(Y)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(X \times Y)$$

for any $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set)$.

It is shown that $A/\mathscr{I} = \{A(X)/\mathscr{I}(X)\}_{X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set)}$ naturally becomes a Green functor, with structure morphisms and cross product induced from those of A ([8], [2]).

Lemma 2.5. *Let T be a Tambara functor, and let $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ be an ideal. Then $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T^\alpha$ becomes a functorial ideal.*

Proof. Since T^α is commutative as a Green functor, it suffices to show

$$cr(T^\alpha(X) \times \mathscr{I}(Y)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(X \times Y)$$

for each $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set)$. This immediately follows from

$$p_X^*(x) \cdot p_Y^*(y) \in p_X^* \cdot \mathscr{I}(X \times Y) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(X \times Y)$$

for any $x \in T^\alpha(X) = T(X)$ and $y \in \mathscr{I}(Y)$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathscr{I}$ be an ideal of a Tambara functor T. Then*

$$T/\mathscr{I} = \{T(X)/\mathscr{I}(X)\}_{X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)}$$

has a natural structure of a Tambara functor induced from that of T.

Moreover, projections $T(X)\to T(X)/\mathscr{I}(X)$ give a morphism of Tambara functors $T\to T/\mathscr{I}$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.5 $T/\mathscr{I}$ becomes a Green functor, with induced restrictions and additive transfers. Thus it suffices to show that multiplicative transfers are well-defined by

$$f_\bullet\colon T(X)/\mathscr{I}(X)\to T(Y)/\mathscr{I}(Y)\ ;\ x+\mathscr{I}(X)\mapsto f_\bullet(x)+\mathscr{I}(Y),$$

for each $f\in {}_G set(X,Y)$. This well-definedness follows from the addition formula. In fact, in the notation of Remark 1.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_\bullet(x+\mathscr{I}(X)) &= s_+(t_\bullet r^*(x)\cdot t'_\bullet r'^*(\mathscr{I}(X)))\\
&\subseteq s_+(t_\bullet r^*(x)\cdot t'_\bullet(\mathscr{I}(U')))\\
&\subseteq s_+(t_\bullet r^*(x)\cdot (t'_\bullet(0)+\mathscr{I}(V)))\\
&\subseteq s_+((t_\bullet r^*(x)\cdot t'_\bullet(0))+\mathscr{I}(V))\\
&\subseteq s_+(t_\bullet r^*(x)\cdot t'_\bullet(0))+\mathscr{I}(Y)\\
&= f_\bullet(x)+\mathscr{I}(Y).
\end{aligned}$$

The latter part is trivial. □

Example 2.7. Let m be an arbitrary integer. Let Ω be the Burnside Tambara functor, and let $m\Omega\subseteq\Omega$ be a family of ideals

$$m\Omega = \{m(\Omega(X))\}_{X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)}.$$

Then $m\Omega\subseteq\Omega^\alpha$ is a functorial ideal in the sense of Definition 2.4, while it is not necessarily an ideal of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1, except $m=0,\pm1$.

In fact, when $G=\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, for the canonical projection $p_e^G\colon G/e\to G/G$, we have

$$(p_e^G)_\bullet(2(G/e\xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}}G/e)) = 2(G/G\xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}}G/G)+(G/e\xrightarrow{p_e^G}G/G),$$

and thus $(p_e^G)_\bullet(2\Omega(G/e))\subseteq(p_e^G)_\bullet(0)+2\Omega(G/G)$ is not satisfied since $(p_e^G)_\bullet(0)=0$.

Definition 2.8. Let T be a Tambara functor. For each $f\in{}_G set(X,Y)$, define $f_!\colon T(X)\to T(Y)$ by

$$f_!(x)=f_\bullet(x)-f_\bullet(0)$$

for any $x\in T(X)$. With this definition, the condition (iii) in Definition 2.1 can be written as

(iii)′ $f_!(\mathscr{I}(X))\subseteq\mathscr{I}(Y)$.

Lemma 2.9. *Let T be a Tambara functor. Then, we have the following for any $f\in{}_G set(X,Y)$.*

1. *$f_!$ satisfies $f_!(x)f_!(y)=f_!(xy)$ for any $x,y\in T(X)$.*
2. *If f is surjective, then we have $f_!=f_\bullet$.*

(3) *If*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X' \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "\xi"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & Y' \arrow[d, "\eta"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"'] & Y \end{tikzcd}$$

is a pull-back diagram, then $f'_! \, \xi^* = \eta^* f_!$ *holds.*

(4) *If*

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[d, "f"'] & A \arrow[l, "p"'] & Z \arrow[l, "\lambda"'] \arrow[d, "\rho"] \\ Y & \mathit{exp} & \Pi \arrow[ll, "\pi"] \end{tikzcd}$$

is an exponential diagram, then $\pi_+ \rho_! \, \lambda^* = f_! \, p_+$ *holds.*

(5) *If* S *is another Tambara functor and* $\varphi\colon T \to S$ *is a morphism of Tambara functors, then* $\varphi_Y f_! = f_! \, \varphi_X$ *holds.*

Proof. (1) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} f_!(x) f_!(y) &= (f_\bullet(x) - f_\bullet(0))(f_\bullet(y) - f_\bullet(0)) \\ &= f_\bullet(x) f_\bullet(y) - f_\bullet(x) f_\bullet(0) - f_\bullet(0) f_\bullet(y) + f_\bullet(0) f_\bullet(0) \\ &= f_\bullet(x) f_\bullet(y) - f_\bullet(0). \end{aligned}$$

(2) follows from the fact that $f_!(0) = 0$ is satisfied for any surjective f (Fact 1.5). (3) follows from that, for any $x \in T(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} f'_! \, \xi^*(x) &= f'_\bullet \xi^*(x) - f'_\bullet(0) \ = \ f'_\bullet \xi^*(x) - f'_\bullet \xi^*(0) \\ &= \eta^* f_\bullet(x) - \eta^* f_\bullet(0) \ = \ \eta^*(f_\bullet(x) - f_\bullet(0)) \ = \ \eta^*(f_!(x)). \end{aligned}$$

(4) follows from that, for any $a \in T(A)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_+ \rho_! \lambda^*(a) &= \pi_+(\rho_\bullet \lambda^*(a) - \rho_\bullet \lambda^*(0)) \\ &= \pi_+ \rho_\bullet \lambda^*(a) - \pi_+ \rho_\bullet \lambda^*(0) \\ &= f_\bullet p_+(a) - f_\bullet p_+(0) \ = \ f_! \, p_+(a). \end{aligned}$$

(5) follows from the additivity of φ.

□

Proposition 2.10. *If* $\varphi\colon T \to S$ *is a morphism of Tambara functors, then* $\mathit{Ker}\,\varphi = \{\mathit{Ker}(\varphi_X)\}_{X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)}$ *is an ideal of* T.

Proof. Condition (iii)$'$ in Definition 2.8 follows from (5) in Lemma 2.9. The other conditions are obviously satisfied. □

Remark 2.11. If $\varphi\colon T \to S$ is a morphism of Tambara functors, then it can be shown easily that $\mathit{Im}\,\varphi = \{\mathit{Im}(\varphi_X)\}_{X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)}$ is a Tambara subfunctor of S, and we have a natural isomorphism of Tambara functors

$$T/\mathit{Ker}\,\varphi \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathit{Im}\,\varphi,$$

compatible with φ and the projection $T \to T/\mathit{Ker}\,\varphi$.

Proposition 2.6 and Proposition 2.10 mean that the ideals of a Tambara functor T and projections from T correspond essentially bijectively.

In this article, we say a morphism of Tambara functors $\varphi\colon T\to S$ is *surjective* if φ_X is surjective for any $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.

Proposition 2.12.

(1) *Let $\varphi\colon T\to S$ be a morphism in Tam(G). If we define $\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J})$ by*

$$(\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}))(X)=\varphi_X^{-1}(\mathscr{J}(X))\quad({}^{\forall}X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set))$$

for each ideal $\mathscr{J}\subseteq S$, then φ^{-1} gives a map

$$\varphi^{-1}\colon\{\textit{ ideals of } S\,\}\to\{\textit{ ideals of } T\,\}\ ;\ \mathscr{J}\mapsto\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}),$$

which preserves inclusions of ideals.

(2) *Let $\varphi\colon T\to S$ be a surjective morphism of Tambara functors. If we define $\varphi(\mathscr{I})$ by*

$$\varphi(\mathscr{I})(X)=\varphi_X(\mathscr{I}(X))\quad({}^{\forall}X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set))$$

for each ideal $\mathscr{I}\subseteq T$ containing Ker φ, then this gives a map

$$\{\textit{ ideals of } T \textit{ containing Ker}\,\varphi\,\}\to\{\textit{ ideals of } S\,\}\ ;\ \mathscr{I}\mapsto\varphi(\mathscr{I})$$

which preserves inclusions of ideals.

(3) *Let $\mathscr{I}$ be an ideal of T, and let $p\colon T\to T/\mathscr{I}$ be the projection. Then the maps in* (1) *and* (2) *give a bijection*

$$p^{-1}\colon\{\textit{ ideals of } T/\mathscr{I}\,\}\xrightarrow{1:1}\{\textit{ ideals of } T \textit{ containing } \mathscr{I}\,\}.$$

Proof. These follow immediately from the definition. □

For any $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, we denote the unique map from X to the one-point set G/G by $\mathrm{pt}_X\colon X\to G/G$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $\mathscr{I}\subseteq T$ be an ideal. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) $\mathscr{I}=T$.
(2) $1\in\mathscr{I}(X)$ *for any* $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.
(3) $1\in\mathscr{I}(X)$ *for some* $\emptyset\neq X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.

Proof. Obviously (1) and (2) are equivalent, and (2) implies (3). Thus it suffices to show that (3) implies (2).

Assume $\mathscr{I}$ satisfies $1\in\mathscr{I}(X)$ for some non-empty $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Remark that we have $f_{\bullet}(0)=0$ for any surjective map $f\in{}_G set(X,X')$. Especially if $X'=G/G$, then $(\mathrm{pt}_X)_{\bullet}(0)=0$. Thus by condition (iii) in Definition 2.1, we have $1=(\mathrm{pt}_X)_{\bullet}(1)\in\mathscr{I}(G/G)$. Consequently for any $Y\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, we have $1=\mathrm{pt}_Y^{*}(1)\in\mathscr{I}(Y)$. □

We have the following type of ideals. (We remark that, not all the ideals are of this form. See Example 4.27.)

Proposition 2.14. *Let T be a Tambara functor, and $I\subseteq T(G/e)$ be a G-invariant ideal of $T(G/e)$. Then there exists an ideal $\mathscr{I}_I\subseteq T$ satisfying $\mathscr{I}_I(G/e)=I$.*

Moreover by construction, $\mathscr{I}_I$ is the maximum one among the ideals $\mathscr{I}$ satisfying $\mathscr{I}(G/e)=I$.

Proof. For each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, define $\mathscr{I}_I(X)$ by

$$\mathscr{I}_I(X) = \bigcap_{\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)} (\gamma^*)^{-1}(I). \tag{2.1}$$

Obviously $\mathscr{I}_I$ satisfies $\mathscr{I}_I(G/e) = I$. It remains to show $\mathscr{I}_I$ is closed under $f^*, f_+, f_!$ for each $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$.

Let $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$ be any G-map. Obviously we have $f^*(\mathscr{I}_I(Y)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}_I(X)$. We show $f_+(\mathscr{I}_I(X)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(Y)$. ($f_!(\mathscr{I}_I(X)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(Y)$ is shown in the same way.) For any $\gamma_Y \in {}_G set(G/e, Y)$, take a pull-back diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r, "f'"] \arrow[d, "\xi"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\Box"] & G/e \arrow[d, "\gamma_Y"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"'] & Y .
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then we have $\gamma_Y^* f_+(x) = f'_+ \xi^*(x)$ for each $x \in \mathscr{I}_I(X)$. Since any point in X' has a stabilizer equal to e, we may assume this diagram is of the form

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underset{n}{\amalg} G/e \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\Box"] & G/e \arrow[d, "\gamma_Y"] \\
X \arrow[r, "f"'] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\underset{n}{\amalg} G/e$ is the direct sum of n-copies of G/e for some natural number n. Thus we have

$$\gamma_Y^* f_+(x) = \sum_{1 \le i \le n} g_i \cdot \gamma_i^*(x)$$

for some $g_i \in G$ and $\gamma_i \in {}_G set(G/e, X)$ $(1 \le i \le n)$. Since I is closed under the action of G, this implies $\gamma_Y^* f_+(x) \in I$, and thus $f_+(x) \in \mathscr{I}_I(Y)$. □

3. Operations on ideals

Some operations for the ideals of Tambara functors can be performed, in the same manner as in the ordinary ideal theory for commutative rings.

Notation 3.1. Let T be a Tambara functor on G. If $\mathscr{G}$ is a subset of $\coprod_{X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)} T(X)$, we say '$\mathscr{G}$ is a subset of T', and write abbreviately $\mathscr{G} \subseteq T$.

For any subset $\mathscr{G} \subseteq T$, we put $\mathscr{G}(X) = \mathscr{G} \cap T(X)$ $({}^\forall X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set))$. In this notation, remark that we have $\mathscr{G} = \coprod_{X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)} \mathscr{G}(X)$.

3.1. **Intersection of ideals.**

We can take the intersection of ideals. This enables us to consider a *generator* of an ideal.

Proposition 3.2. *Let T be a Tambara functor and let $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a family of ideals of T. If we define a subset $\mathscr{K} \subseteq T$ by*

$$\mathscr{K}(X) = \{\bigcap_\lambda \mathscr{I}_\lambda(X)\}_{X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)}$$

for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$*, then* $\mathscr{K}$ *becomes an ideal of* T*. This is called the intersection of* $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$*, and denoted by* $\mathscr{K} = \bigcap\limits_{\lambda} \mathscr{I}_\lambda$*. If* $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *is a finite set of ideals* $\{\mathscr{I}_1, \ldots, \mathscr{I}_\ell\}$*, we also denote it by*

$$\bigcap_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathscr{I}_\lambda = \bigcap_{1\le i\le \ell} \mathscr{I}_i = \mathscr{I}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathscr{I}_\ell.$$

Proof. This immediately follows from the definition of ideals. □

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq T$ be a subset. The *ideal generated by* $\mathscr{G}$ is defined as the intersection of ideals containing all elements in $\mathscr{G}$:

$$\bigcap \{ \mathscr{I} \subseteq T \text{ ideal } \mid \mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{I} \ \}.$$

Obviously this is the smallest ideal containing $\mathscr{G}$. We denote this ideal by $\langle \mathscr{G} \rangle$, and call $\mathscr{G}$ the *generator* of this ideal. If $\mathscr{G}$ is a finite set $\mathscr{G} = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell\} \subseteq T$, then we denote $\langle \mathscr{G} \rangle$ by $\langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_\ell \rangle$. In particular if a is an element of T, then $\langle \{a\} \rangle$ is denoted by $\langle a \rangle$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let* T *be a Tambara functor, and let* $a \in T(A)$ *be an element for some* $A \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$*. Then* $\langle a \rangle$ *can be calculated as*

$$\langle a \rangle(X) = \{\alpha = u_+(c \cdot (v_! w^*(a))) \mid X \overset{u}{\leftarrow} C \overset{v}{\leftarrow} D \overset{w}{\rightarrow} A,\ c \in T(C)\} \tag{3.1}$$

for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$*.*

Proof. Denote the right hand side by $\mathscr{I}_a(X)$. Since $\langle a \rangle$ is closed under u_+, $v_!$, w^*, obviously we have $\langle a \rangle(X) \supseteq \mathscr{I}_a(X)$ for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Thus it suffices to show that $\mathscr{I}_a = \{\mathscr{I}_a(X)\}_{X\in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)}$ forms an ideal of T.

First we show $\mathscr{I}_a(X)$ is an ideal of $T(X)$ for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Suppose we are given two elements in $\mathscr{I}_a(X)$

$$\alpha = u_+(c \cdot (v_! w^*(a))) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha' = u'_+(c' \cdot (v'_! w'^*(a)))$$

with

$$X \overset{u}{\leftarrow} C \overset{v}{\leftarrow} D \overset{w}{\rightarrow} A, \quad c \in T(C),$$
$$X \overset{u'}{\leftarrow} C' \overset{v'}{\leftarrow} D' \overset{w'}{\rightarrow} A, \quad c' \in T(C').$$

Then for

$$X \overset{u\cup u'}{\longleftarrow} C \amalg C' \overset{v\amalg v'}{\longleftarrow} D \amalg D' \overset{w\cup w'}{\longrightarrow} A, \quad (c, c') \in T(C \amalg C'),$$

we have

$$\alpha + \alpha' = (u \cup u')_+((c, c') \cdot (v \amalg v')_!(w \cup w')^*(a)) \in \mathscr{I}_a(X).$$

(Here we used the identification $T(C \amalg C') \cong T(C) \times T(C')$.) Besides, for any $r \in T(X)$, we have

$$r\alpha = r \cdot (u_+(c \cdot (v_! w^*(a)))) = u_+(\,(u^*(r) \cdot c) \cdot (v_! w^*(a))\,) \in \mathscr{I}_a(X).$$

Thus $\mathscr{I}_a(X) \subseteq T(X)$ is an ideal.

It remains to show $\mathscr{I}_a$ is closed under $(\,)_+$, $(\,)_\bullet$ and $(\,)^*$.

Let $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$ be any morphism. For any $\alpha = u_+(c \cdot (v_! w^*(a))) \in \mathscr{I}_a(X)$ as in (3.1), we have

$$f_+(\alpha) = (f \circ u)_+(c \cdot (v_! w^*(a))) \in \mathscr{I}_a(Y).$$

Thus $f_+(\mathscr{I}_a(X)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}_a(Y)$.

If we take an exponential diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[d, "f"'] \arrow[drr, phantom, "exp"] & C \arrow[l, "u"'] & Z \arrow[l, "p"'] \arrow[d, "f'"] \\
Y & & C' \arrow[ll, "u'"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

and a pull-back

$$\begin{tikzcd}
D \arrow[d, "v"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & D' \arrow[l, "p'"'] \arrow[d, "v'"] \\
C & Z \arrow[l, "p"]
\end{tikzcd} ,$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_!(\alpha) &= f_! u_+(c\cdot(v_! w^*(a))) \ = \ u'_+ f'_! p^*(c\cdot(v_! w^*(a))) \\
&= u'_+(\,(f'_! p^*(c))\cdot((f'\circ v')_!(w\circ p')^*(a))\,) \ \in \ \mathscr{I}_a(Y).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $f_!(\mathscr{I}_a(X)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}_a(Y)$.

Let $g \in {}_G set(W,X)$ be any morphism. For any $\alpha = u_+(c\cdot(v_! w^*(a))) \in \mathscr{I}_a(X)$ as in (3.1), if we take pull-backs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W \arrow[d, "g"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & C' \arrow[l, "u'"'] \arrow[d, "g'"] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & D' \arrow[l, "v'"'] \arrow[d, "g''"] \\
X & C \arrow[l, "u"] & D \arrow[l, "v"]
\end{tikzcd} ,$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g^*(\alpha) &= g^* u_+(c\cdot(v_! w^*(a))) \ = \ u'_+ g'^*(c\cdot(v_! w^*(a))) \\
&= u'_+(\,g'^*(c)\cdot(v'_!(w\circ g'')^*(a))\,) \ \in \mathscr{I}_a(W).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $g^*(\mathscr{I}_a(X)) \subseteq \mathscr{I}_a(W)$. ☐

3.2. **Some remarks on Noetherian property.**

Proposition 3.5. *Let T be a Tambara functor on G. If $T(X)$ is a Noetherian ring for each transitive $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, then any sequence of ideals*

$$\mathscr{I}_1 \subseteq \mathscr{I}_2 \subseteq \mathscr{I}_3 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq T \tag{3.2}$$

should be stable.

Proof. Assume we are given a sequence of ideals (3.2). For each transitive X, a sequence of ideals

$$\mathscr{I}_1(X) \subseteq \mathscr{I}_2(X) \subseteq \mathscr{I}_3(X) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq T(X)$$

is induced, and there exists a natural number n_X such that $\mathscr{I}_{n_X}(X) = \underset{n}{\cup}\mathscr{I}_n(X)$, since $T(X)$ is Noetherian. If we put $n_0 = \max\{n_X \mid X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set) \text{ transitive}\}$, then we obtain $\mathscr{I}_{n_0} = \underset{n}{\cup}\mathscr{I}_n$. ☐

Proposition 3.6. *Let T be a Tambara functor, and $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ be an ideal. If $\mathscr{I}$ is generated by a finite subset $\mathscr{G} \subseteq T$, then $\mathscr{I}$ can be generated by a single element.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathscr{I}$ is generated by $\mathscr{G}=\{s_1,\ldots,s_n\}$ for some $s_i\in T(X_i)$. Put $X=X_1\amalg\cdots\amalg X_n$, let $\iota_i\colon X_i\hookrightarrow X$ be the inclusion $(1\le{}^{\forall}i\le n)$, and put

$$s=\iota_{1+}(s_1)+\cdots+\iota_{n+}(s_n). \tag{3.3}$$

It suffices to show that an ideal $\mathscr{J}$ of T contains $\mathscr{G}$ if and only if $\mathscr{J}$ contains s. This follows immediately from (3.3) and $s_i=\iota_i^*(s)$ $(1\le{}^{\forall}i\le n)$. $\square$

3.3. **Product of ideals.**

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\mathscr{I},\mathscr{J}\subseteq T$ be ideals. If we define a subset $\mathscr{K}\subseteq T$ by*

$$\mathscr{K}(X)=\{x\in T(X)\mid x=p_+(ab)\ \textit{for some}\ p\in{}_G set(A,X),a\in\mathscr{I}(A),b\in\mathscr{J}(A)\}$$

for each $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, then $\mathscr{K}$ is an ideal of T. This is called the product of $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{J}$, and denoted by $\mathscr{K}=\mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}$.

Proof. First we show $\mathscr{K}(X)\subseteq T(X)$ is an ideal for each X. Let $x=p_+(ab)$ and $x'=p'_+(a'b')$ be any pair of elements in $\mathscr{K}(X)$, where

$$\begin{gathered} p\in{}_G set(A,X),a\in\mathscr{I}(A),b\in\mathscr{J}(A),\\ p'\in{}_G set(A',X),a'\in\mathscr{I}(A'),b'\in\mathscr{J}(A'). \end{gathered}$$

Then, for $p\cup p'\in{}_G set(A\amalg A',X)$, $(a,a')\in\mathscr{I}(A\amalg A')$ and $(b,b')\in\mathscr{J}(A\amalg A')$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x+x' &= p_+(ab)+p'_+(a'b')\ =\ (p\cup p')_+(ab,a'b')\\ &= (p\cup p')_+((a,a')\cdot(b,b'))\ \in\mathscr{K}(X). \end{aligned}$$

(Here we used the identification $\mathscr{I}(A\amalg A')\cong\mathscr{I}(A)\times\mathscr{I}(A')$, $\mathscr{J}(A\amalg A')\cong\mathscr{I}(A)\times\mathscr{J}(A')$.) Also for any $r\in T(X)$, we have

$$rx=rp_+(ab)=p_+(p^*(r)ab)\ \in\mathscr{K}(X).$$

Thus $\mathscr{K}(X)$ is an ideal of $T(X)$.

To show $\mathscr{K}$ is an ideal of T, it suffices to show $\mathscr{K}$ is closed under $f^*,f_+,f_!$ for any $f\in{}_G set(X,Y)$. Let $x=p_+(ab)$ be any element in $\mathscr{K}(X)$ as above. Then we have $f_+(x)=(f\circ p)_+(ab)\in\mathscr{K}(Y)$. Thus $f_+(\mathscr{K}(X))\subseteq\mathscr{K}(Y)$. Also, if we take an exponential diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[d, "f"'] & A \arrow[l, "p"'] \arrow[d, phantom, "exp"] & Z \arrow[l, "\lambda"'] \arrow[d, "\rho"] \\ Y & & \Pi \arrow[ll, "\pi"] \end{tikzcd},$$

then we have

$$f_!(x)=f_!\,p_+(ab)\ =\ \pi_+\rho_!\,\lambda^*(ab)=\pi_+(\rho_!\,\lambda^*(a)\cdot\rho_!\,\lambda^*(b))\in\mathscr{K}(Y).$$

Thus $f_!(\mathscr{K}(X))\subseteq\mathscr{K}(Y)$.

Let $y=q_+(cd)$ be any element in $\mathscr{K}(Y)$, where $q\in{}_G set(B,Y)$, $c\in\mathscr{I}(B)$, $d\in\mathscr{J}(B)$. If we take a pull-back diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} A \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, "p"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & B \arrow[d, "q"] \\ X \arrow[r, "f"'] & Y \end{tikzcd},$$

then we have

$$f^*(y) = f^*q_+(cd) = p_+g^*(cd) = p_+(g^*(c)g^*(d)) \in \mathscr{K}(X).$$

Thus $f^*(\mathscr{K}(Y)) \subseteq \mathscr{K}(X)$. □

Remark 3.8. Let T be a Tambara functor.

(1) For each ideals $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{J}$ of T, we have $\mathscr{I}\mathscr{J} \subseteq \mathscr{I} \cap \mathscr{J}$.

(2) For each ideals $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{J}$ of T, we have

$$\mathscr{I}(X)\mathscr{J}(X) \subseteq \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}(X)$$

for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Here, the left hand side is the ordinary product of ideals in $T(X)$.

(3) If $\mathscr{I}_1 \subseteq \mathscr{J}_1$, $\mathscr{I}_2 \subseteq \mathscr{J}_2$ are ideals of T, then we have $\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2 \subseteq \mathscr{J}_1\mathscr{J}_2$.

Proof. These immediately follows from Proposition 3.2. □

Proposition 3.9. *If $\mathscr{I}_1, \mathscr{I}_2, \mathscr{I}_3$ are ideals of a Tambara functor T, then we have*

$$(\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2)\mathscr{I}_3 = \mathscr{I}_1(\mathscr{I}_2\mathscr{I}_3).$$

More precisely, for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, both $((\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2)\mathscr{I}_3)(X)$ and $(\mathscr{I}_1(\mathscr{I}_2\mathscr{I}_3))(X)$ agree with the set

$$\mathscr{K}_{1,2,3}(X) = \left\{ p_+(a_1a_2a_3) \in T(X) \;\middle|\; p \in {}_G set(A, X), \quad \begin{array}{c} a_i \in \mathscr{I}_i(A) \\ (i = 1, 2, 3) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Inductively, for any ideals $\mathscr{I}_1, \mathscr{I}_2, \ldots, \mathscr{I}_\ell \subseteq T$, we have

$$(\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2 \cdots \mathscr{I}_\ell)(X) = \left\{ p_+(a_1a_2 \cdots a_\ell) \;\middle|\; p \in {}_G set(A, X), \quad \begin{array}{c} a_i \in \mathscr{I}_i(A) \\ (1 \le i \le \ell) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Especially, $\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2 \cdots \mathscr{I}_\ell$ does not depend on the order of the products. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the n-times product of an ideal $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ by $\mathscr{I}^n$.

Proof. We only show

$$((\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2)\mathscr{I}_3)(X) = \mathscr{K}_{1,2,3}(X)$$

for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. $\mathscr{K}_{1,2,3}(X) = (\mathscr{I}_1(\mathscr{I}_2\mathscr{I}_3))(X)$ can be shown in the same way.

By definition of the product, we have

$$((\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2)\mathscr{I}_3)(X) = \left\{ p_+(b_1q_+(b_2b_3)) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} p \in {}_G set(A, X), \\ q \in {}_G set(B, A), \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} b_1 \in \mathscr{I}_1(A), \\ b_2 \in \mathscr{I}_2(B), \\ b_3 \in \mathscr{I}_3(B) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Thus $((\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2)\mathscr{I}_3)(X) \supseteq \mathscr{K}_{1,2,3}(X)$ follows if we put $B = A$, $q = \mathrm{id}_A$ and $b_i = a_i$ $(1 \le i \le 3)$.

Conversely, any element $p_+(b_1q_+(b_2b_3))$ as in (3.4) is written as

$$\begin{aligned} p_+(b_1q_+(b_2b_3)) &= p_+(q_+(q^*(b_1)b_2b_3)) \\ &= (p \circ q)_+(q^*(b_1)b_2b_3)) \end{aligned}$$

by the projection formula, which means $((\mathscr{I}_1\mathscr{I}_2)\mathscr{I}_3)(X) \subseteq \mathscr{K}_{1,2,3}(X)$. □

Lemma 3.10. *Let*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
C_1 \arrow[d, "u_1"'] & C \arrow[l, "p_1"'] \arrow[d, "p_2"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\square"] \\
B & C_2 \arrow[l, "u_2"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

be a pull-back diagram in ${}_G set$*, and put*

$$u = u_1 \circ p_1 = u_2 \circ p_2.$$

Then for any $\alpha_1 \in T(C_1)$ *and* $\alpha_2 \in T(C_2)$*, we have*

$$u_{1+}(\alpha_1) \cdot u_{2+}(\alpha_2) = u_+(p_1^*(\alpha_1) \cdot p_2^*(\alpha_2)).$$

Proof. By the projection formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{1+}(\alpha_1) \cdot u_{2+}(\alpha_2) &= u_{2+}((u_2^* u_{1+}(\alpha_1)) \cdot \alpha_2) \;=\; u_{2+}((p_{2+} p_1^*(\alpha_1)) \cdot \alpha_2) \\
&= u_{2+}(p_{2+}(p_1^*(\alpha_1) \cdot p_2^*(\alpha_2))) \;=\; u_+(p_1^*(\alpha_1) \cdot p_2^*(\alpha_2)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 3.11. *Let* T *be a Tambara functor, and let* $a_1 \in T(A_1)$, $a_2 \in T(A_2)$ *be elements for some* $A_1, A_2 \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$*. Then,* $\langle a_1 \rangle \langle a_2 \rangle$ *can be calculated as*

$$(\langle a_1 \rangle \langle a_2 \rangle)(X) = \left\{ u_+(c\,\delta_1 \delta_2) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{cc} \begin{tikzcd}[row sep=small] & D_1 \arrow[r, "w_1"] & A_1 \\ X & C \arrow[l, "u"'] & \\ & D_2 \arrow[r, "w_2"] \arrow[ul, "v_2"] & A_2 \end{tikzcd} & \begin{array}{c} \delta_1 = v_{1!} w_1^*(a_1) \\ \delta_2 = v_{2!} w_2^*(a_2) \\ c \in T(C) \end{array} \end{array} \right\}$$

with $v_1 \colon D_1 \to C$ and $v_2 \colon D_2 \to C$,

for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$*.*

Proof. Denote the right hand side by $\mathscr{I}_{a_1,a_2}(X)$. By Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.7, $(\langle a_1 \rangle \langle a_2 \rangle)(X)$ is equal to the set

(3.5)
$$\left\{ p_+(u_{1+}(\alpha_1) u_{2+}(\alpha_2)) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{cc} B \overset{u_1}{\leftarrow} C_1 \overset{v_1}{\leftarrow} D_1 \overset{w_1}{\rightarrow} A_1 & \alpha_1 = c_1 \cdot (v_{1!} w_1^*(a_1)) \\ B \overset{u_2}{\leftarrow} C_2 \overset{v_2}{\leftarrow} D_2 \overset{w_2}{\rightarrow} A_2 & \alpha_2 = c_2 \cdot (v_{2!} w_2^*(a_2)) \\ & c_1 \in T(C_1),\ c_2 \in T(C_2) \\ & p \in {}_G set(B, X) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus $(\langle a_1 \rangle \langle a_2 \rangle)(X) \supseteq \mathscr{I}_{a_1,a_2}(X)$ is shown, by letting $B = C_1 = C_2 = C$, $u_1 = u_2 = \mathrm{id}_C$, $c_1 = c$, $c_2 = 1$ and $p = u$ in (3.5).

Conversely, we show $(\langle a_1 \rangle \langle a_2 \rangle)(X) \subseteq \mathscr{I}_{a_1,a_2}(X)$. Let $\omega = p_+(u_{1+}(\alpha_1) u_{2+}(\alpha_2))$ be any element in $(\langle a_1 \rangle \langle a_2 \rangle)(X)$ as in (3.5). If we take pull-backs

$$\begin{tikzcd}
D_1 \arrow[d, "v_1"'] & D'_1 \arrow[l, "q_1"'] \arrow[d, "v'_1"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\square"] & \\
C_1 \arrow[d, "u_1"'] & C \arrow[l, "p_1"'] \arrow[d, "p_2"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\square"] & D'_2 \arrow[l, "u'_2"'] \arrow[d, "q_2"] \arrow[dl, phantom, "\square"] \\
B & C_2 \arrow[l, "u_2"] & D_2, \arrow[l, "v_2"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

and put $u = u_1 \circ p_1 = u_2 \circ p_2$, then by Lemma 3.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega &= p_+(u_{1+}(\alpha_1) u_{2+}(\alpha_2)) \;=\; p_+ u_+(p_1^*(\alpha_1) p_2^*(\alpha_2)) \\
&= (p \circ u)_+(\, p_1^*(c_1) \cdot p_2^*(c_2) \cdot (v'_{1!}(w_1 \circ q_1)^*(a_1)) \cdot (v'_{2!}(w_2 \circ q_2)^*(a_2))\,) \\
&\in \mathscr{I}_{a_1,a_2}(X),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus $(\langle a_1\rangle\langle a_2\rangle)(X)\subseteq \mathscr{I}_{a_1,a_2}(X)$. □

Corollary 3.12. *Let* $\mathscr{I}\subseteq T$ *be an ideal, and let* $a\in T(A)$, $b\in T(B)$ *be elements for some* $A,B\in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. *Then, the following are equivalent.*

1. $\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle\subseteq\mathscr{I}$.
2. *For any* $C\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ *and any pair of diagrams*

$$C\overset{v}{\leftarrow} D\overset{w}{\rightarrow} A,\qquad C\overset{v'}{\leftarrow} D'\overset{w'}{\rightarrow} B, \tag{3.6}$$

$\mathscr{I}(C)$ *satisfies* $(v_!w^*(a))\cdot(v'_!w'^*(b))\in\mathscr{I}(C)$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.11, $\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle\subseteq\mathscr{I}$ if and only if for any

$$X,C\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set),\quad p\in {}_G set(C,X),\quad c\in T(C),$$

and any pair of diagrams (3.6),

$$p_+(c\cdot(v_!w^*(a))\cdot(v'_!w'^*(b)))\in\mathscr{I}(X)$$

is satisfied. Since $\mathscr{I}$ is an ideal, if $(v_!w^*(a))\cdot(v'_!w'^*(b))\in\mathscr{I}(C)$, then automatically $p_+(c\cdot(v_!w^*(a))\cdot(v'_!w'^*(b)))\in\mathscr{I}(X)$ follows. Thus $\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle\subseteq\mathscr{I}$ if and only if $\mathscr{I}$ satisfies condition (2). □

3.4. **Sum of ideals.**

Proposition 3.13. *Let* $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *be a family of ideals in* T. *If we define a subset* $\mathscr{K}\subseteq T$ *by*

$$\mathscr{K}(X)=\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathscr{I}_\lambda(X)$$

for each $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, *where the right hand side is the ordinary sum of ideals in* $T(X)$, *then* $\mathscr{K}$ *is an ideal of* T. *This is called the sum of* $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$, *and denoted by* $\mathscr{K}=\sum\limits_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathscr{I}_\lambda$. *Obviously, this is the smallest ideal containing* $\mathscr{I}_\lambda$ *for all* λ. *If* $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *is a finite set of ideals* $\{\mathscr{I}_1,\ldots,\mathscr{I}_\ell\}$, *we also denote it by*

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathscr{I}_\lambda=\sum_{1\le i\le \ell}\mathscr{I}_i=\mathscr{I}_1+\cdots+\mathscr{I}_\ell.$$

Proof. Since the other conditions are trivial, we only show $\mathscr{K}$ satisfies

$$f_!(\mathscr{K}(X))\subseteq\mathscr{K}(Y)$$

for any $f\in {}_G set(X,Y)$. Namely, for any finite sum $x=\sum\limits_{1\le i\le k}a_i$ with $a_i\in\mathscr{I}_{\lambda_i}(X)$ and for any f, we show $f_!(x)\in\mathscr{K}(Y)$. Obviously this is reduced to the following case of the finite sum:

Claim 3.14. *If* $\mathscr{I}_1,\ldots,\mathscr{I}_\ell$ *are ideals of* T, *then a subset* $\mathscr{K}\subseteq T$ *defined by*

$$\mathscr{K}(X)=\mathscr{I}_1(X)+\cdots+\mathscr{I}_\ell(X)\quad({}^\forall X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set))$$

becomes an ideal $\mathscr{K}\subseteq T$.

Moreover, by an induction, it suffices to show Claim 3.14 for $\ell=2$.

Let $\mathscr{I},\mathscr{J}$ be ideals, and let $a\in\mathscr{I}(X)$, $b\in\mathscr{J}(X)$ be any pair of elements. Then for any $f\in {}_G set(X,Y)$, we have

$$f_\bullet(a+b)=s_+(t_\bullet r^*(a)\cdot t'_\bullet r'^*(b)) \tag{3.7}$$

in the notation of Remark 1.4. Since $t_{\bullet}(\mathscr{I}(U)) \subseteq t_{\bullet}(0) + \mathscr{I}(V)$, there exists an element $\alpha \in \mathscr{I}(V)$ such that $t_{\bullet}r^{*}(a) = t_{\bullet}(0) + \alpha$. Similarly there is $\beta \in \mathscr{J}(V)$ such that $t'_{\bullet}r'^{*}(b) = t'_{\bullet}(0) + \beta$. Then we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (3.7) & = & s_{+}(t_{\bullet}(0)t'_{\bullet}(0) + \alpha t'_{\bullet}(0) + t_{\bullet}(0)\beta + \alpha\beta) \\ & \subseteq & s_{+}(t_{\bullet}(0)t'_{\bullet}(0)) + \mathscr{I}(Y) + \mathscr{J}(Y) + (\mathscr{I} \cap \mathscr{J})(Y) \\ & = & f_{\bullet}(0) + \mathscr{I}(Y) + \mathscr{J}(Y) + (\mathscr{I} \cap \mathscr{J})(Y) \\ & \subseteq & f_{\bullet}(0) + \mathscr{I}(Y) + \mathscr{J}(Y). \end{array}$$

Thus Claim 3.14 is shown, and Proposition 3.13 follows. □

Proposition 3.15. *If* $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J}, \mathscr{I}', \mathscr{J}' \subseteq T$ *are ideals, we have*

$$(\mathscr{I} + \mathscr{J})(\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{J}') = \mathscr{I}\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}' + \mathscr{I}'\mathscr{J} + \mathscr{J}\mathscr{J}'.$$

Proof. First we show $(\mathscr{I} + \mathscr{J})(\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{J}') \subseteq \mathscr{I}\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}' + \mathscr{I}'\mathscr{J} + \mathscr{J}\mathscr{J}'$. For any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_{G}set)$, any element $\alpha \in (\mathscr{I} + \mathscr{J})(\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{J}')(X)$ is of the form

$$\alpha = p_{+}((a+b)(a'+b')),$$

where $p \in {}_{G}set(A, X),\ a \in \mathscr{I}(A),\ a' \in \mathscr{I}'(A),\ b \in \mathscr{J}(A),\ b' \in \mathscr{J}'(A)$, and thus we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \alpha & = & p_{+}(aa') + p_{+}(ab') + p_{+}(ba') + p_{+}(bb') \\ & \in & (\mathscr{I}\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}' + \mathscr{I}'\mathscr{J} + \mathscr{J}\mathscr{J}')(X). \end{array}$$

Conversely, let β be any element in $(\mathscr{I}\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}' + \mathscr{I}'\mathscr{J} + \mathscr{J}\mathscr{J}')(X)$. There exist

$$\begin{array}{l} p_1 \in {}_{G}set(A_1, X),\ a_1 \in \mathscr{I}(A_1),\ a'_1 \in \mathscr{I}'(A_1) \\ p_2 \in {}_{G}set(A_2, X),\ a_2 \in \mathscr{I}(A_2),\ b'_2 \in \mathscr{J}'(A_2) \\ p_3 \in {}_{G}set(A_3, X),\ a'_3 \in \mathscr{I}'(A_3),\ b_3 \in \mathscr{J}(A_3) \\ p_4 \in {}_{G}set(A_4, X),\ b_4 \in \mathscr{J}(A_4),\ b'_4 \in \mathscr{J}'(A_4) \end{array}$$

such that

$$\beta = p_{1+}(a_1a'_1) + p_{2+}(a_2b'_2) + p_{3+}(a'_3b_3) + p_{4+}(b_4b'_4). \tag{3.8}$$

If we put $A = A_1 \amalg A_2 \amalg A_3 \amalg A_4$ and put

$$\begin{array}{rl} a = (a_1, a_2, 0, 0) & \in \mathscr{I}(A) \\ a' = (a'_1, 0, a'_3, 0) & \in \mathscr{I}'(A) \\ b = (0, 0, b_3, b_4) & \in \mathscr{J}(A) \\ b' = (0, b'_2, 0, b'_4) & \in \mathscr{J}'(A) \end{array}$$

(here, we used the identification $\mathscr{I}(A) \cong \mathscr{I}(A_1) \times \mathscr{I}(A_2) \times \mathscr{I}(A_3) \times \mathscr{I}(A_4)$, and so on), then we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\mathscr{I} + \mathscr{J})(\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{J}')(X) & \ni & p_{+}((a+b)(a'+b')) \\ & = & p_{+}(a_1a'_1, a_2b'_2, b_3a'_3, b_4b'_4) \\ & = & p_{1+}(a_1a'_1) + p_{2+}(a_2b'_2) + p_{3+}(b_3a'_3) + p_{4+}(b_4b'_4). \end{array}$$

By (3.8), we obtain $\beta \in (\mathscr{I} + \mathscr{J})(\mathscr{I}' + \mathscr{J}')(X)$. □

Definition 3.16. Let $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J} \subseteq T$ be ideals. $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{J}$ are *coprime* if $\mathscr{I} + \mathscr{J} = T$. If $\mathscr{I}_1, \ldots, \mathscr{I}_{\ell} \subseteq T$ are ideals, $\mathscr{I}_1, \ldots, \mathscr{I}_{\ell}$ are *pairwise coprime* if $\mathscr{I}_i$ and $\mathscr{I}_j$ are coprime for any $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$.

Remark 3.17. Let $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J} \subseteq T$ be ideals. By Proposition 2.13 and Proposition 3.13, the following are equivalent.

1. $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{J}$ are coprime.
2. $\mathscr{I}(X)$ and $\mathscr{J}(X)$ are coprime for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.
3. $\mathscr{I}(X)$ and $\mathscr{J}(X)$ are coprime for some $\emptyset \neq X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.

Corollary 3.18. *Let $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J} \subseteq T$ be ideals. If $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{J}$ are coprime, then we have*

$$\mathscr{I}(X)\mathscr{J}(X) = \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}(X)$$

for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Here, the left hand side is the ordinary product of ideals in $T(X)$.

Proof. Assume $\mathscr{I}$ and $\mathscr{J}$ are coprime. By Remark 3.17, $\mathscr{I}(X)$ and $\mathscr{J}(X)$ are coprime for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Then by the ordinary ideal theory for commutative rings, we have

$$\mathscr{I}(X)\mathscr{J}(X) = \mathscr{I}(X) \cap \mathscr{J}(X).$$

On the other hand, by Remark 3.8, we have

$$\mathscr{I}(X)\mathscr{J}(X) \subseteq \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}(X) \subseteq \mathscr{I}(X) \cap \mathscr{J}(X).$$

Thus it follows $\mathscr{I}(X)\mathscr{J}(X) = \mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}(X)$. □

From this, the Chinese remainder theorem for a Tambara functor immediately follows:

Corollary 3.19. *If $\mathscr{I}_1, \ldots, \mathscr{I}_\ell \subseteq T$ are pairwise coprime ideals, then we have the following.*

1. $(\mathscr{I}_1 \cdots \mathscr{I}_\ell)(X) = \mathscr{I}_1(X) \cdots \mathscr{I}_\ell(X)$ *for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.*
2. $\mathscr{I}_1 \cdots \mathscr{I}_\ell = \mathscr{I}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathscr{I}_\ell$.
3. *The projections $T/(\mathscr{I}_1 \cdots \mathscr{I}_\ell) \to T/\mathscr{I}_i \ \ (1 \leq i \leq \ell)$ induce an isomorphism of Tambara functors*

$$T/(\mathscr{I}_1 \cdots \mathscr{I}_\ell) \xrightarrow{\cong} T/\mathscr{I}_1 \times \cdots \times T/\mathscr{I}_\ell.$$

Proof. (1) follows immediately from Corollary 3.18, by induction. By Corollary 3.18, (2) and (3) can be confirmed on each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, which is well known in the ordinary ideal theory for commutative rings. □

4. Prime ideals

In the rest of this article, we assume T is non-trivial, namely $T \neq 0$.

4.1. Definition of a prime ideal.

Definition 4.1. An ideal $\mathfrak{p} \subsetneq T$ is *prime* if for any transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and any $a \in T(X)$, $b \in T(Y)$,

$$\langle a \rangle \langle b \rangle \subseteq \mathfrak{p} \quad \Rightarrow \quad a \in \mathfrak{p}(X) \ \text{ or } \ b \in \mathfrak{p}(Y)$$

is satisfied. Remark that the converse always holds.

An ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subsetneq T$ is *maximal* if it is maximal with respect to the inclusion of ideals not equal to T.

Remark 4.2. If $\mathscr{I} \subsetneq T$ is an ideal not equal to T, then by Zorn's lemma, there exists some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subsetneq T$ containing $\mathscr{I}$.

Obviously, when G is trivial, the definition of a prime (resp. maximal) ideal agrees with the ordinary definition of a prime (resp. maximal) ideal.

Proposition 4.3. *Any maximal ideal* $\mathfrak{m}\subseteq T$ *is prime.*

Proof. Let $X,Y\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ be transitive, and let $a\in T(X)$, $b\in T(Y)$. Suppose $a\notin\mathfrak{m}(X)$ and $b\notin\mathfrak{m}(Y)$. This means $\mathfrak{m}\subsetneq(\mathfrak{m}+\langle a\rangle)$ and $\mathfrak{m}\subsetneq(\mathfrak{m}+\langle b\rangle)$, and we have $\mathfrak{m}+\langle a\rangle=T$ and $\mathfrak{m}+\langle b\rangle=T$ by the maximality of $\mathfrak{m}$. Thus $(\mathfrak{m}+\langle a\rangle)(\mathfrak{m}+\langle b\rangle)=TT=T$. Since

$$\begin{array}{rcl}(\mathfrak{m}+\langle a\rangle)(\mathfrak{m}+\langle b\rangle)&=&\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{m}+\mathfrak{m}\langle a\rangle+\langle b\rangle\mathfrak{m}+\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle\\ &\subseteq&\mathfrak{m}+\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle\end{array}$$

by Proposition 3.15, it follows $\mathfrak{m}+\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle=T$, which means $\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle\nsubseteq\mathfrak{m}$. □

Proposition 4.4. *Let* $\mathfrak{p}\subsetneq T$ *be an ideal. The following are equivalent.*

1. $\mathfrak{p}$ *is prime.*
2. *For any pair of ideals* $\mathscr{I},\mathscr{J}\subseteq T$,
$$\mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}\subseteq\mathfrak{p}\ \Rightarrow\ \mathscr{I}\subseteq\mathfrak{p}\ \text{or}\ \mathscr{J}\subseteq\mathfrak{p}$$
is satisfied. (*The converse always holds.*)

Proof. Obviously (2) implies (1). We show the converse. Suppose $\mathscr{J}\nsubseteq\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}\subseteq\mathfrak{p}$. By $\mathscr{J}\nsubseteq\mathfrak{p}$, there exist some transitive $Y\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and $b\in\mathscr{J}(Y)$ such that $b\notin\mathfrak{p}(Y)$. For any transitive $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and any $a\in\mathscr{I}(X)$, we have

$$\langle a\rangle\langle b\rangle\subseteq\mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}\subseteq\mathfrak{p}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, we obtain $a\in\mathfrak{p}(X)$. Thus $\mathscr{I}(X)\subseteq\mathfrak{p}(X)$ for any transitive $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, which means $\mathscr{I}\subseteq\mathfrak{p}$. □

By virtue of Corollary 3.12, Definition 4.1 is rewritten as follows.

Corollary 4.5. *An ideal* $\mathfrak{p}\subsetneq T$ *is prime if and only if the following two conditions become equivalent, for any transitive* $X,Y\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ *and any* $a\in T(X)$, $b\in T(Y)$:

1. *For any* $C\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ *and for any pair of diagrams*
$$C\overset{v}{\leftarrow}D\overset{w}{\rightarrow}X,\quad C\overset{v'}{\leftarrow}D'\overset{w'}{\rightarrow}Y,$$
$\mathfrak{p}(C)$ *satisfies*
$$(v_!w^*(a))\cdot(v'_!w'^*(b))\in\mathfrak{p}(C).$$
2. $a\in\mathfrak{p}(X)$ *or* $b\in\mathfrak{p}(Y)$.

Also remark that (2) *always implies* (1).

4.2. **Spectrum of a Tambara functor.**

Definition 4.6. For any Tambara functor T on G, define $\mathit{Spec}(T)$ to be the set of all prime ideals of T. For each ideal $\mathscr{I}\subseteq T$, define a subset $V(\mathscr{I})\subseteq\mathit{Spec}(T)$ by

$$V(\mathscr{I})=\{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathit{Spec}(T)\mid\mathscr{I}\subseteq\mathfrak{p}\}.$$

Remark 4.7. For any Tambara functor T, we have the following.

1. $V(\mathscr{I})=\emptyset$ if and only if $\mathscr{I}=T$.
2. $V(\mathscr{I})=\mathit{Spec}(T)$ if and only if $\mathscr{I}\subseteq\bigcap\limits_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathit{Spec}(T)}\mathfrak{p}$.

Proof. (1) $V(T)=\emptyset$ is obvious. The converse follows from Remark 4.2 and Proposition 4.3.

(2) This is trivial.

□

Proposition 4.8. *For any Tambara functor T, the family $\{V(\mathscr{I}) \mid \mathscr{I} \subseteq T \text{ ideal}\}$ forms a system of closed subsets of $Spec(T)$.*

Proof. By Remark 4.7, we have $V((0)) = Spec(T)$ and $V(T) = \emptyset$. By Proposition 3.13, we have $\bigcap\limits_{\lambda\in\Lambda} V(\mathscr{I}_\lambda) = V(\sum\limits_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \mathscr{I}_\lambda)$ for any family of ideals $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$. By Proposition 4.4, we have $V(\mathscr{I}\mathscr{J}) = V(\mathscr{I}) \cup V(\mathscr{J})$ for any pair of ideals $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J} \subseteq T$. □

Regarding Proposition 2.12, we have the following.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $\varphi\colon T \to S$ be a morphism in $Tam(G)$.*

1. *$\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}) \subseteq T$ becomes prime if $\mathfrak{q} \subsetneq S$ is a prime ideal. This gives a continuous map*
$$\varphi^a\colon Spec(S) \to Spec(T)\ ;\ \mathfrak{q} \mapsto \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}).$$
2. *Assume φ is surjective. Then, $\varphi(\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq S$ becomes prime if $\mathfrak{p} \subsetneq T$ is a prime ideal containing $Ker\,\varphi$. This gives a continuous map*
$$\varphi_\sharp\colon V(Ker\,\varphi) \to Spec(S)\ ;\ \mathfrak{p} \mapsto \varphi(\mathfrak{p}).$$

Proof. We use the criterion of Corollary 4.5.

(1) Let $\mathfrak{q} \subsetneq S$ be a prime ideal. Firstly, since $1 \in \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})(X)$ would imply $1 \in \mathfrak{q}(X)$ $({}^\forall X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set))$, we have $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}) \subsetneq T$.

Let $a \in T(X)$, $b \in T(Y)$ be any pair of elements with $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ transitive, satisfying
$$a \notin \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})(X) = \varphi_X^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}(X)), \quad b \notin \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})(Y) = \varphi_Y^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}(Y)).$$
Since $\mathfrak{q}$ is prime, they satisfy
$$(v_!w^*(\varphi_X(a))) \cdot (v'_!w'^*(\varphi_Y(b))) \notin \mathfrak{q}(C)$$
for some
$$C \overset{v}{\leftarrow} D \overset{w}{\rightarrow} X, \quad C \overset{v'}{\leftarrow} D' \overset{w'}{\rightarrow} Y.$$
Thus we have
$$\varphi_C((v_!w^*(a)) \cdot (v'_!w'^*(b))) = (v_!w^*(\varphi_X(a))) \cdot (v'_!w'^*(\varphi_Y(b))) \notin \mathfrak{q}(C),$$
which means $(v_!w^*(a)) \cdot (v'_!w'^*(b)) \notin \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})(C)$, and thus $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$ is prime.

Moreover, we have
$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi^a)^{-1}(V(\mathscr{I})) &= \{\mathfrak{q} \in Spec(S) \mid \mathscr{I} \subseteq \varphi^a(\mathfrak{q})\}\\ &= \{\mathfrak{q} \in Spec(S) \mid \langle\varphi(\mathscr{I})\rangle \subseteq \mathfrak{q}\}\\ &= V(\langle\varphi(\mathscr{I})\rangle)\end{aligned}$$
for each ideal $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$, which means φ^a is a continuous map. Here, $\varphi(\mathscr{I}) \subseteq S$ is a subset defined by $(\varphi(\mathscr{I}))(X) = \varphi_X(\mathscr{I}(X))$.

(2) Let $\mathfrak{p} \subsetneq T$ be a prime ideal containing $Ker\,\varphi$. Firstly, since $Ker\,\varphi \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ and $1 \in \varphi(\mathfrak{p})(X)$ would imply $1 \in \mathfrak{p}(X)$ $({}^\forall X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set))$, we have $\varphi(\mathfrak{p}) \subsetneq S$.

Let $c \in S(X)$, $d \in S(Y)$ be any pair of elements with $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ transitive, satisfying
$$c \notin \varphi(\mathfrak{p})(X) = \varphi_X(\mathfrak{p}(X)), \quad d \notin \varphi(\mathfrak{p})(Y) = \varphi_Y(\mathfrak{p}(Y)). \tag{4.1}$$

Since φ is surjective, there exists some elements $a \in T(X)$ and $b \in T(Y)$ such that $\varphi_X(a) = c$, $\varphi_Y(b) = d$. By (4.1), it follows

$$a \notin \mathfrak{p}(X), \quad b \notin \mathfrak{p}(Y).$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, they satisfy

$$(v_! w^*(a)) \cdot (v'_! w'^*(b)) \notin \mathfrak{p}(C)$$

for some

$$C \overset{v}{\leftarrow} D \overset{w}{\rightarrow} X, \quad C \overset{v'}{\leftarrow} D' \overset{w'}{\rightarrow} Y.$$

By $Ker\,\varphi \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, we have

$$\varphi_C((v_! w^*(a)) \cdot (v'_! w'^*(b))) \notin \varphi_C(\mathfrak{p}(C)),$$

and thus

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (v_! w^*(c)) \cdot (v'_! w'^*(d)) & = & (v_! w^* \varphi_X(a)) \cdot (v'_! w'^* \varphi_Y(b)) \\ & = & \varphi_C((v_! w^*(a)) \cdot (v'_! w'^*(b))) \\ & \notin & \varphi_C(\mathfrak{p}(C)), \end{array}$$

which means $\varphi(\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq S$ is prime.

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\varphi_\sharp)^{-1}(V(\mathscr{J})) & = & \{\mathfrak{p} \in V(Ker\,\varphi) \mid \mathscr{J} \subseteq \varphi_\sharp(\mathfrak{p})\} \\ & = & \{\mathfrak{p} \in V(Ker\,\varphi) \mid \varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}\} \\ & = & V(\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J})) \end{array}$$

for each ideal $\mathscr{J} \subseteq S$, which means $\varphi_\sharp$ is a continuous map.

□

Corollary 4.10. *Let T be a Tambara functor and let $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ be an ideal. Then the projection $p\colon T \to T/\mathscr{I}$ induces a homeomorphism between $Spec(T/\mathscr{I})$ and $V(\mathscr{I}) \subseteq Spec(T)$*

$$p^a\colon Spec(T/\mathscr{I}) \xrightarrow{\approx} V(\mathscr{I}),$$

with the inverse $p_\sharp$.

Proof. This immediately follows from Theorem 4.9. □

Definition 4.11. A Tambara functor T is *reduced* if it satisfies

$$\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in Spec(T)} \mathfrak{p} = 0.$$

Remark 4.12. If $\varphi\colon T \to S$ is a surjective map of Tambara functors, then for any family of ideals $\{\mathscr{I}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ of T containing $Ker\,\varphi$, we have

$$\varphi(\bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathscr{I}_\lambda) = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \varphi(\mathscr{I}_\lambda).$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.12, there is an ideal $\mathscr{J}_\lambda \subset S$ satisfying $\mathscr{I}_\lambda = \varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}_\lambda)$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Since we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathscr{J}_\lambda & = & \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathscr{J}_\lambda)) = \varphi(\bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}_\lambda)) \\ & \subseteq & \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}_\lambda)) = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathscr{J}_\lambda, \end{array}$$

we have

$$\varphi(\bigcap_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}_\lambda))=\bigcap_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{J}_\lambda)),$$

namely

$$\varphi(\bigcap_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathscr{I}_\lambda)=\bigcap_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\varphi(\mathscr{I}_\lambda).$$

□

Corollary 4.13. *For any Tambara functor T, if we define T_{red} by*

$$T_{\mathrm{red}}=T/\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in Spec(T)}\mathfrak{p},$$

then T_{red} becomes a reduced Tambara functor. Obviously, T is reduced if and only if $T=T_{\mathrm{red}}$.

Moreover, the projection $T\to T_{\mathrm{red}}$ induces a natural homeomorphism

$$p_\sharp\colon Spec(T)\to Spec(T_{\mathrm{red}}).$$

Proof. By Corollary 4.10,

$$p_\sharp\colon V(\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in Spec(T)}\mathfrak{p})\to Spec(T_{\mathrm{red}})\ ;\ \mathfrak{p}\mapsto p(\mathfrak{p})$$

is a bijection, and we have

$$\bigcap_{\mathfrak{q}\in Spec(T_{\mathrm{red}})}\mathfrak{q}=\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in Spec(T)}p(\mathfrak{p})=p(\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in Spec(T)}\mathfrak{p})=(0)$$

by Remark 4.12.

The latter part also follows from Corollary 4.10, since we have

$$V(\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in Spec(T)}\mathfrak{p})=Spec(T),$$

by Remark 4.7. □

Lemma 4.14. *Let T,T_1,T_2 be non-trivial Tambara functors on G, satisfying $T=T_1\times T_2$ as Tambara functors. Then any ideal of T is of the form $\mathscr{I}_1\times\mathscr{I}_2$, where $\mathscr{I}_1\subseteq T_1$ and $\mathscr{I}_2\subseteq T_2$ are ideals.*

Moreover, for any ideals $\mathscr{I}_1\subseteq T_1$ and $\mathscr{I}_2\subseteq T_2$, the ideal $\mathscr{I}_1\times\mathscr{I}_2\subseteq T$ is prime if and only if

$$\mathscr{I}_1=T_1 \text{ and } \mathscr{I}_2\subseteq T_2 \text{ is prime}$$

or

$$\mathscr{I}_1\subseteq T_1 \text{ is prime and } \mathscr{I}_2=T_2$$

holds.

Proof. The forepart immediately follows from the definition of an ideal.

To show the latter part, we use the criterion of Proposition 4.4. Suppose $\mathscr{I}_1\times\mathscr{I}_2$ is prime. Since

$$(T_1\times(0))((0)\times T_2)=(0)\times(0)\subseteq\mathscr{I}_1\times\mathscr{I}_2,$$

it follows

$$T_1\times(0)\subseteq\mathscr{I}_1\times\mathscr{I}_2 \text{ or } (0)\times T_2\subseteq\mathscr{I}_1\times\mathscr{I}_2,$$

namely, $\mathscr{I}_1=T_1$ or $\mathscr{I}_2=T_2$.

Suppose $\mathscr{I}_1 = T_1$. Then, since

$$(T_1 \times T_2)/(T_1 \times \mathscr{I}_2) \cong T_2/\mathscr{I}_2,$$

$T_1 \times \mathscr{I}_2 \subseteq T$ is prime if and only if $\mathscr{I}_2 \subseteq T_2$ is prime. $\square$

Proposition 4.15. *For any Tambara functor T, the following are equivalent.*

1. *$Spec(T)$ is disconnected.*
2. *There exist coprime ideals $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J} \subseteq T_{\mathrm{red}}$ such that $\mathscr{I} \cap \mathscr{J} = (0)$.*
3. *For any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, there exist $a, b \in T_{\mathrm{red}}(X)$ satisfying $a + b = 1$ and $\langle a \rangle \langle b \rangle = (0)$.*
4. *For some non-empty $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, there exist $a, b \in T_{\mathrm{red}}(X)$ satisfying $a + b = 1$ and $\langle a \rangle \langle b \rangle = (0)$.*
5. *There exists a pair of non-trivial Tambara functors T_1 and T_2, and an isomorphism of Tambara functors $T_{\mathrm{red}} \cong T_1 \times T_2$.*

Proof. By Corollary 4.13, we may assume T is reduced, $T_{\mathrm{red}} = T$.

Suppose $Spec(T)$ is disconnected. By definition of the topology on $Spec(T)$, this is equivalent to the existence of ideals $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J} \subseteq T$ satisfying

$$V(\mathscr{I}) \cup V(\mathscr{J}) = Spec(T) \quad \text{and} \quad V(\mathscr{I}) \cap V(\mathscr{J}) = \emptyset.$$

By Remark 4.7, this is equivalent to

$$\mathscr{I} \cap \mathscr{J} = (0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{I} + \mathscr{J} = T.$$

Thus (1) is equivalent to (2).

If T satisfies (2), then we have

$$T = T/(\mathscr{I} \cap \mathscr{J}) \cong T/\mathscr{I} \times T/\mathscr{J}$$

by Corollary 3.19, and thus (5) follows. Besides, (5) implies (1) by Lemma 4.14, since we have $Spec(T) = V((0) \times T_2) \amalg V(T_1 \times (0)) \, (\approx Spec(T_1) \amalg Spec(T_2))$. Obviously (3) implies (4), and (4) implies (2). Thus it remains to show that (2) implies (3).

If there exist ideals $\mathscr{I}, \mathscr{J} \subseteq T$ satisfying (2), then for any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, there exist $a \in \mathscr{I}(X)$ and $b \in \mathscr{J}(X)$ such that $a + b = 1$ by Remark 3.17 In particular $\langle a \rangle$ and $\langle b \rangle$ are coprime, and we have

$$\langle a \rangle \langle b \rangle = \langle a \rangle \cap \langle b \rangle \subseteq \mathscr{I} \cap \mathscr{J} = (0),$$

and thus (3) follows. $\square$

We can take the radical of an ideal as follows.

Proposition 4.16. *Let $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ be an ideal. If we define a subset $\sqrt{\mathscr{I}} \subseteq T$ by*

$$\sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(X) = \{a \in T(X) \mid \langle a \rangle^n \subseteq \mathscr{I} \quad ({}^{\exists} n \in \mathbb{N})\}$$

for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, then $\sqrt{\mathscr{I}}$ becomes an ideal of T. We call this the radical of $\mathscr{I}$.

Proof. First we show $\sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(X) \subseteq T(X)$ is an ideal for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.

Take any $a, b \in \sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(X)$, and suppose

$$\langle a \rangle^m \subseteq \mathscr{I}, \quad \langle b \rangle^n \subseteq \mathscr{I}$$

holds for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $a+b \in (\langle a\rangle + \langle b\rangle)(X)$, we have

$$\langle a+b\rangle^{m+n} \subseteq (\langle a\rangle + \langle b\rangle)^{m+n} = \sum_{i=0}^{m+n} \langle a\rangle^{m+n-i}\langle b\rangle^{i} \quad \subseteq \mathscr{I},$$

and thus $a+b \in \sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(X)$. Besides, for any $r \in T(X)$, since $ra \in \langle a\rangle$, we have

$$\langle ra\rangle^m \subseteq \langle a\rangle^m \subseteq \mathscr{I},$$

and thus $ra \in \sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(X)$.

It remains to show $\sqrt{\mathscr{I}}$ is closed under $(\,)_+, (\,)_!, (\,)^*$. Take any $f \in {}_G set(X,Y)$ and any $g \in {}_G set(W,X)$. Since we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f_+(a) & \in & \langle a\rangle(Y), \\ f_!(a) & \in & \langle a\rangle(Y), \\ g^*(a) & \in & \langle a\rangle(W) \end{array}$$

by the definition of an ideal, it follows

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \langle f_+(a)\rangle^m & \subseteq & \langle a\rangle^m \subseteq \mathscr{I}, \\ \langle f_!(a)\rangle^m & \subseteq & \langle a\rangle^m \subseteq \mathscr{I}, \\ \langle g^*(a)\rangle^m & \subseteq & \langle a\rangle^m \subseteq \mathscr{I}, \end{array}$$

which means $f_+(a), f_!(a) \in \sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(Y)$ and $g^*(a) \in \sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(W)$. □

Proposition 4.17. *Let T be a Tambara functor. For any ideal $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$, we have*

$$\sqrt{\mathscr{I}} \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathscr{I})} \mathfrak{p}.$$

In particular, $\sqrt{(0)} = (0)$ follows if T is reduced.

Proof. Let $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ be any transitive G-set. For any $a \in \sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(X)$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\langle a\rangle^n \subseteq \mathscr{I}$. Thus for any $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathscr{I})$, we have

$$\langle a\rangle^n \subseteq \mathscr{I} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, this means $\langle a\rangle \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, namely $a \in \mathfrak{p}(X)$. Thus we obtain $\sqrt{\mathscr{I}}(X) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}(X)$. □

Corollary 4.18. *$V(\sqrt{\mathscr{I}}) = V(\mathscr{I})$ holds for any ideal $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$.*

Proof. By the definition of $\sqrt{\mathscr{I}}$, we have $\mathscr{I} \subseteq \sqrt{\mathscr{I}}$, which implies $V(\mathscr{I}) \supseteq V(\sqrt{\mathscr{I}})$. Conversely, Proposition 4.17 means $V(\mathscr{I}) \subseteq V(\sqrt{\mathscr{I}})$. □

4.3. **Monomorphic restriction condition.**

Consider the following condition for a Tambara functor T, which we call the '*monomorphic restriction condition*'. This condition will be frequently used in the next subsection.

Definition 4.19. A contravariant functor

$$F \colon {}_G set \to Set$$

is said to satisfy *monomorphic restriction condition* (MRC) if it satisfies the following.

(MRC) For any $f \in {}_G set(X,Y)$ between transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, the restriction f^* is monomorphic.

Obviously, (MRC) is equivalent to the following.

(MRC)$'$ For any transitive $Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and $\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, Y)$, the restriction γ^* is monomorphic. (Moreover, this condition does not depend on the choice of γ.)

Abbreviately, we say a Tambara functor T *satisfies (MRC)* if T^* satisfies (MRC).

Example 4.20. A Tambara functor T satisfies (MRC) for example in the following cases.

1. T is a fixed point functor $\mathcal{P}_R$ associated to some G-ring R.
2. T is additively cohomological, and $T(X)$ has no $|G|$-torsion for each transitive $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Here $|G|$ denotes the order of G.

Proof. (1) follows from the definition of $\mathcal{P}_R$. We show (2). Since T is additively cohomological, for any $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$ between transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, we have

$$f_+ f^*(y) = (\deg f)\, y \qquad ({}^\forall y \in T(Y)).$$

Since $\deg f$ divides $|G|$ and $T(Y)$ has no $|G|$-torsion, this implies $f_+ f^*$ is monomorphic. Especially f^* is monomorphic. $\square$

Proposition 4.21. *For any Tambara functor T on G, the following are equivalent.*

1. *T satisfies* (MRC).
2. *T is a Tambara subfunctor $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_R$ for some G-ring R.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{P}_R$ satisfies (MRC) , obviously (2) implies (1). To show the converse, we use the following.

Lemma 4.22.

1. *Let $M = (M^*, M_*)$ and $M' = (M'^*, M'_*)$ be two semi-Mackey functors on G, satisfying $M^* \subseteq M'^*$ as monoid-valued contravariant functors ${}_G set \to Mon$.*
   (Namely, $M(X) \subseteq M'(X)$ is a submonoid for each $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and satisfy $M'^*(f)|_{M(X)} = M^*(f)$ for any morphism $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$.)
   If M'^* (and thus also M^*) satisfies (MRC)*, then we have $M \subseteq M'$ as semi-Mackey functors.*
2. *If T and T' are Tambara functors satisfying* (MRC) *and if there exists an inclusive morphism of ring-valued contravariant functors $\iota\colon T^* \hookrightarrow T'^*$, then ι gives an inclusion of Tambara functors. Moreover if $\iota\colon T^* \xrightarrow{\cong} T'^*$ is an isomorphism of ring-valued functors, then ι gives an isomorphism of Tambara functors,*

Suppose Lemma 4.22 is shown. Let T be a Tambara functor satisfying (MRC). Endow $R = T(G/e)$ with the induced G-action, and take the fixed point functor $\mathcal{P}_R$ associated to R.

For any $H \leq G$, if we let $p^H_e\colon G/e \to G/H$ be the canonical projection, then we have

$$T(G/H) \overset{(p^H_e)^*}{\hookrightarrow} T(G/e)$$

by (MRC). Since this is G-equivariant and H acts on $T(G/H)$ trivially, we obtain

$$T(G/H) \overset{(p^H_e)^*}{\hookrightarrow} T(G/e)^H.$$

This means $(p_e^H)^*$ factors through $R^H = \mathcal{P}_R(G/H)$, namely, there exists (uniquely) a ring homomorphism $\iota_H \colon T(G/H) \to \mathcal{P}_R(G/H)$ which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T(G/e) \arrow[r, equal] & \mathcal{P}_R(G/e) \\
T(G/H) \arrow[u, hook, "(p_e^H)^*"] \arrow[r, "\exists \iota_H"'] \arrow[ur, phantom, "\circlearrowleft"] & \mathcal{P}_R(G/H) \arrow[u, hook]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Thus ι_H becomes monomorphic by this commutativity. It can be shown that $\{\iota_H\}_{H \le G}$ is compatible with conjugation maps. Besides, for any $K \le H \le G$, we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T(G/K) \arrow[r, hook, "\iota_K"] & \mathcal{P}_R(G/e) \\
T(G/H) \arrow[u, hook, "(p_K^H)^*"] \arrow[r, hook, "\iota_H"'] \arrow[ur, phantom, "\circlearrowleft"] & \mathcal{P}_R(G/H). \arrow[u, hook]
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the additivity of T^* and $\mathcal{P}_R^*$, it turns out that $\{\iota_H\}_{H \le G}$ yields a injective natural transformation $\iota \colon T^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_R^*$ of ring-valued contravariant functors. By Lemma 4.22, $\iota \colon T \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_R$ becomes a inclusive morphism of Tambara functors, and T can be regarded as a Tambara subfunctor of $\mathcal{P}_R$ through ι.

Thus it remains to show Lemma 4.22.

Proof of Lemma 4.22. Remark that (2) follows immediately if we apply (1) to the additive and multiplicative parts respectively. Thus we only show (1).

It suffices to show

$$M'_*(f)|_{M(X)} = M_*(f)$$

for any morphism $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$. Furthermore, it is enough to show this for transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$.

Let $f \in {}_G set(X, Y)$ be any morphism between transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Let $\gamma_Y \in {}_G set(G/e, Y)$ be a morphism, and take a pullback diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & X \arrow[d, "f"] \\
G/e \arrow[r, "\gamma_Y"'] & Y\ .
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.2}$$

Since any point of X' has the stabilizer equal to e, we may assume (4.2) is of the form

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\coprod_{1 \le i \le n} G/e \arrow[r, "\underset{1 \le i \le n}{\cup} \zeta_i"] \arrow[d, "\nabla"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & X \arrow[d, "f"] \\
G/e \arrow[r, "\gamma_Y"'] & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

for some $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n \in {}_G set(G/e, X)$.

By the Mackey condition, for any $x \in M(X)$ $(\subseteq M'(X))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M'^*(\gamma_Y)M_*(f)(x) &= M^*(\gamma_Y)M_*(f)(x) \\ &= \sum_{1\le i\le n} M^*(\zeta_i)(x) \\ &= \sum_{1\le i\le n} M'^*(\zeta_i)(x) \\ &= M'^*(\gamma_Y)M'_*(f)(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since $M'^*(\gamma_Y)$ is monomorphic, we obtain

$$M_*(f)(x) = M'_*(f)(x) \quad ({}^\forall x \in M(X)),$$

which means $M_*(f) = M'_*(f)|_{M(X)}$. □

□

As in the proof of Lemma 4.22, any Tambara functor T satisfying (MRC) becomes a Tambara subfunctor of $\mathcal{P}_{T(G/e)}$. It will be a natural question whether, for a ring R, there exists a non-trivial Tambara subfunctor $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_R$ satisfying $T(G/e) = R$. The following gives some criterion and a counterexample.

Example 4.23.

(1) Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field satisfying $(\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}), |G|) = 1$. If a Tambara subfunctor $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{F}$ satisfies $T(G/e) = \mathbb{F}$, then it satisfies $T = \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{F}$.

(2) Let $G = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ for some prime number p, let k be a field with characteristic p, and let $R = k[\mathbf{X}]$ be a polynomial ring, on which G acts trivially. Then $\mathcal{P}_R$ admits a Tambara subfunctor T defined by $T(G/e) = R$ and $T(G/G) = R^p = \{f^p \mid f \in R\}$.

Proof. (1) It suffices to show $T(G/H) = \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{F}(G/H)$ holds for any $H \le G$. Let $x \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{F}(G/H) = \mathbb{F}^H$ be any element. Remark that we have

$$(p_e^H)_+(p_e^H)^*(x) = |H| \cdot x, \tag{4.3}$$

where $|H|$ is the order of H. Since $(\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}), |G|) = 1$ by assumption, we can easily show $\frac{1}{|H|}x \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{F}(G/H)$. Applying (4.3) to $\frac{1}{|H|}x$, we obtain

$$(p_e^H)_+(p_e^H)^*(\frac{1}{|H|}x) = |H| \cdot \frac{1}{|H|}x = x.$$

Since T is closed under $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}+}$ and $T(G/e) = \mathbb{F} \ni \frac{1}{|H|}(p_e^H)^*(x)$, it follows that

$$x = (p_e^H)_+(\frac{1}{|H|}(p_e^H)^*(x)) \ \in T(G/H).$$

(2) Since G acts on R trivially, it suffices to show T is closed under $\mathcal{P}_R^*(p_e^G)$, $\mathcal{P}_{R+}(p_e^G)$, and $\mathcal{P}_{R\bullet}(p_e^G)$.

Since $T(G/e) = R$, obviously we have $\mathcal{P}_R^*(p_e^G)(T(G/G)) \subseteq T(G/e)$. Moreover, since

$$(\mathcal{P}_{R+}(p_e^G))(f) = pf = 0, \quad (\mathcal{P}_{R\bullet}(p_e^G))(f) = f^p$$

for any $f \in R$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{R+}(p_e^G)(T(G/e)) &\subseteq T(G/G) \\ \mathcal{P}_{R\bullet}(p_e^G)(T(G/e)) &\subseteq T(G/G). \end{aligned}$$

□

Let T be any Tambara functor. As in Proposition 2.14, there exists an ideal

$$\mathscr{I}^T_{(0)} = \mathscr{I}_{(0)} \subseteq T$$

associated to the zero-ideal $(0) \subseteq T(G/e)$. If we define $T_{\mathrm{MRC}} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathit{Tam}(G))$ by $T_{\mathrm{MRC}} = T/\mathscr{I}^T_{(0)}$, then T_{MRC} gives the '*canonical* (MRC)*-zation*' of T. More precisely, we have the following.

Theorem 4.24. *Let* $\mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)} \subseteq \mathit{Tam}(G)$ *denote the full subcategory of Tambara functors satisfying* (MRC). *Then the following holds.*

(1) *For any* $T \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathit{Tam}(G))$, *we have* $T_{\mathrm{MRC}} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)})$.

(2) *The correspondence* $T \mapsto T_{\mathrm{MRC}}$ *gives a functor*

$$(\ )_{\mathrm{MRC}} \colon \mathit{Tam}(G) \to \mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)}.$$

(3) *The functor in* (2) *is left adjoint to the inclusion* $\mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)} \hookrightarrow \mathit{Tam}(G)$.

Proof. (1) For any G-invariant ideal $I \subseteq T(G/e)$, the quotient $T/\mathscr{I}_I$ satisfies (MRC). In fact, for any transitive $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and $\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)$, we have

$$((T/\mathscr{I}_I)^*(\gamma))^{-1}(0) = (T^*(\gamma))^{-1}(I)/(\mathscr{I}_I(X)) = \mathscr{I}_I(X)/\mathscr{I}_I(X) = 0.$$

(2) Let $\varphi \colon T \to S$ be a morphism in $\mathit{Tam}(G)$. For any $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and any $\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)$, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T(G/e) \arrow[r, "\varphi_{G/e}"] & S(G/e) \\
T(X) \arrow[u, "\gamma^*"] \arrow[r, "\varphi_Y"'] \arrow[ur, phantom, "\circlearrowright"] & S(X) \arrow[u, "\gamma^*"']
\end{tikzcd}.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{I}^T_{(0)}(X) &= \bigcap_{\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)} (\gamma^*)^{-1}(0) \\
&\subseteq \bigcap_{\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)} \varphi_X^{-1}((\gamma^*)^{-1}(0)) \ = \ \varphi_X^{-1}(\mathscr{I}^S_{(0)}(X)),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mathscr{I}^T_{(0)} \subseteq \varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{I}^S_{(0)})$. Thus there exists uniquely

$$\bar{\varphi} \in \mathit{Tam}(G)(T_{\mathrm{MRC}}, S_{\mathrm{MRC}}) \ \ (= \mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)}(T_{\mathrm{MRC}}, S_{\mathrm{MRC}}))$$

which makes the following diagram commutative,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T \arrow[r, "\varphi"] \arrow[d, "p^T"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\circlearrowright"] & S \arrow[d, "p^S"] \\
T_{\mathrm{MRC}} \arrow[r, "\bar{\varphi}"'] & S_{\mathrm{MRC}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

where p^T and p^S denote the canonical projections of Tambara functors. By the uniqueness, immediately we obtain a functor $(\ )_{\mathrm{MRC}} \colon \mathit{Tam}(G) \to \mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)}$.

(3) This also follows immediately from the above argument. In fact, for any $T \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathit{Tam}(G))$ and any $S \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)})$, we have a natural bijection

$$- \circ p^T \colon \mathit{Tam}^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)}(T_{\mathrm{MRC}}, S) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathit{Tam}(G)(T, S).$$

$\square$

Example 4.25.

(1) If T satisfies (MRC), then naturally we have $T = T_{\mathrm{MRC}}$.
(2) $\Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}} \cong \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, where G acts trivially on $\mathbb{Z}$ in the right hand side.

Proof. (1) is trivial. We show (2). First we remark the following.

Remark 4.26. For each $H \leq G$, let $\mathcal{O}(H)$ denote a set of representatives of conjugacy classes of subgroups of H. $\mathcal{O}(H)$ has a partial order $\preceq$, defined by

$$K \preceq L \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad K \leq L^h \text{ for some } h \in H$$

for $K, L \in O(H)$. If $K \preceq L$ and $K \neq L^h$ for any $h \in H$, we write $K \prec L$.

$\Omega(G/H)$ is a free module over

$$\{G/K = (G/K \overset{p^H_K}{\to} G/H) \mid K \in \mathcal{O}(H)\},$$

where $p^H_K \colon G/K \to G/H$ is the canonical projection.

Especially, for any transitive $X \cong G/H \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G\mathit{set})$, any $a \in \Omega(X)$ can be decomposed uniquely as

$$a = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{O}(H)} m_K \, G/K \qquad (m_K \in \mathbb{Z}). \tag{4.4}$$

We construct an isomorphism of Tambara functors

$$\wp \colon \Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}} \cong \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Let $\wp_e \colon \Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}(G/e) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{Z}$ be the ring isomorphism given by

$$\wp_e(m\,(G/e \to G/e)) = m \quad ({}^{\forall} m \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

For any $H \leq G$, put $\wp_H = \wp_e \circ (p^H_e)^*$. This is a ring homomorphism.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}\,(G/G) \arrow[dl, "(p^G_H)^*"'] \arrow[ddrr, "\wp_G"] & & & \\
\Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}\,(G/H) \arrow[dd, "(p^H_K)^*"'] \arrow[drrr, "\wp_H"] & \circlearrowright & & & \\
 & \circlearrowright & & \mathbb{Z} & ({}^{\forall}K \leq {}^{\forall}H \leq G) \\
\Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}\,(G/K) \arrow[urrr, "\wp_K"'] \arrow[dr, "(p^K_e)^*"'] & \circlearrowright & & & \\
 & \Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}\,(G/e) \arrow[uurr, "\wp_e"'] & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Remark that $(p^H_e)^* \colon \Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}(G/H) \to \Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}(G/e)$ is monomorphic by Theorem 4.24. Thus $\wp_H$ is monomorphic for any $H \leq G$. On the other hand, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\wp_H(m(H/H \overset{\mathrm{id}}{\to} H/H)) = \wp_e(m(e/e \overset{\mathrm{id}}{\to} e/e)) = m,$$

and thus $\wp_H$ becomes surjective. Thus $\wp_H$ is an isomorphism for each $H \leq G$. As a corollary $(p^H_K)^*$ becomes an isomorphism, and we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}(G/H) \arrow[r, "\wp_H", "\cong"'] \arrow[d, "(p^H_K)^*"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\circlearrowright"] & \mathbb{Z} \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{Z}}"] \\
\Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}}(G/K) \arrow[r, "\cong", "\wp_K"'] & \mathbb{Z}\ .
\end{tikzcd}$$

It can be easily shown that $\{\wp_H\}_{H \leq G}$ is also compatible with conjugation maps, and thus form an isomorphism

$$\wp\colon \Omega^*_{\mathrm{MRC}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{P}^*_{\mathbb{Z}}$$

of ring-valued contravariant functors ${}_G set \to Ring$. By Lemma 4.22, $\wp$ gives an isomorphism of Tambara functors $\wp\colon \Omega_{\mathrm{MRC}} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. □

Example 4.27. As we have seen in the proof of (1) in Theorem 4.24, if an ideal $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ satisfies $T/\mathscr{I} \notin \mathrm{Ob}(Tam^{\mathrm{MRC}}_{(G)})$, then $\mathscr{I}$ can not be written as $\mathscr{I} = \mathscr{I}_I$ for any G-invariant ideal $I \subseteq T(G/e)$.

Consequently, if $\varphi\colon T \to S$ is a morphism of Tambara functors and if S does not satisfy (MRC), then $Ker\,\varphi$ is not of the form $\mathscr{I} = \mathscr{I}_I$, since we have $T/Ker\,\varphi \cong Im\,\varphi \subseteq S$ by Remark 2.11.

For example, if we use the Tambarization functor ([3], [4]), we can construct such an example. For any semi-Mackey functor M on G, if we denote its Tambarization by $\Omega[M]$, then by the functoriality of the Tambarization,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M \arrow[dr, "0"] \arrow[d, phantom, "\circlearrowright"] & \\
0 \arrow[ur, "0"] \arrow[rr, bend right, "\mathrm{id}_0"'] & {} & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

yields a commutative diagram of Tambara functors

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \Omega[M] \arrow[dr, "p"] \arrow[d, phantom, "\circlearrowright"] & \\
\Omega \arrow[ur] \arrow[rr, bend right, "\mathrm{id}_\Omega"'] & {} & \Omega\ .
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since Ω does not satisfy (MRC), $Ker\,p$ is not of the form $\mathscr{I}_I$. Also remark that we have $\Omega[M]/Ker\,p \cong \Omega$.

4.4. **Domains and fields.**

In the commutative ring theory, a ring R is an integral domain (resp. a field) if and only if $(0) \subsetneq R$ is prime (resp. maximal). In a similar way we define a 'domain-like' (resp. 'field-like') Tambara functor, and show some analogous properties.

Definition 4.28. Let T be a Tambara functor.

(1) T is *domain-like* if $(0) \subsetneq T$ is prime.
(2) T is *field-like* if $(0) \subsetneq T$ is maximal.

As a corollary of the arguments so far, we have:

Corollary 4.29. *Let T be a Tambara functor, and $\mathscr{I} \subseteq T$ be an ideal.*

(1) *$\mathscr{I} \subsetneq T$ is a maximal ideal if and only if $T/\mathscr{I}$ is field-like.*
(2) *$\mathscr{I} \subsetneq T$ is a prime ideal if and only if $T/\mathscr{I}$ is domain-like.*
(3) *If T is field-like, then T is domain-like.*

(4) *If T is domain-like, then T is reduced.*

Proof. (1) follows from Proposition 2.12. (2) follows from Theorem 4.9. (3) follows from Proposition 4.3. (4) is trivial. □

Corollary 4.30. *For any Tambara functor T, the following are equivalent.*

1. *T is domain-like.*
2. *For any transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and any non-zero $a \in T(X), b \in T(Y)$, there exists a pair of diagrams*

$$C \overset{v}{\leftarrow} D \overset{w}{\rightarrow} X \quad \textit{and} \quad C \overset{v'}{\leftarrow} D' \overset{w'}{\rightarrow} Y,$$

such that

$$(v_! w^*(a)) \cdot (v'_! w'^*(b)) \neq 0.$$

Proof. This immediately follows from Corollary 4.5. □

Proposition 4.31. *If T satisfies* (MRC) *and $T(G/e)$ is an integral domain, then T is domain-like.*

Proof. We use the criterion of Corollary 4.30. Let $a \in T(X)$ and $b \in T(Y)$ be any pair of elements, with transitive $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$. Suppose

$$(v_! w^*(a)) \cdot (v'_! w'^*(b)) = 0$$

is satisfied for any $C \overset{v}{\leftarrow} D \overset{w}{\rightarrow} X$, $C \overset{v'}{\leftarrow} D' \overset{w'}{\rightarrow} Y$. Especially for morphisms $\gamma \colon G/e \rightarrow X$ and $\gamma' \colon G/e \rightarrow Y$, we have $\gamma^*(a)\gamma'^*(b) = 0$. Since $T(G/e)$ is an integral domain, this is equivalent to

$$\gamma^*(a) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma'^*(b) = 0,$$

which is, in turn, equivalent to

$$a = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad b = 0.$$

□

Theorem 4.32. *For any Tambara functor $T \neq 0$, the following are equivalent.*

1. *T is field-like.*
2. *T satisfies* (MRC)*, and $T(G/e)$ has no non-trivial G-invariant ideal.*

Proof. First we show (1) implies (MRC).

Suppose T does not satisfy (MRC)$'$. Then there exist transitive $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ and non-zero $a \in T(X)$ such that

$$\gamma_0^*(a) = 0$$

holds for some $\gamma_0 \in {}_G set(G/e, X)$. Since any G-map $\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)$ can be written as $\gamma = \gamma_0 \circ f$ for some $f \in {}_G set(G/e, G/e)$, it follows that

$$\gamma^*(a) = f^*\gamma_0^*(a) = 0 \quad ({}^\forall \gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)). \tag{4.5}$$

Recall that, by Proposition 3.4, we have

$$\langle a \rangle (G/e) = \{ p_+(c \cdot (v_! w^*(a))) \mid G/e \overset{p}{\leftarrow} C \overset{v}{\leftarrow} D \overset{w}{\rightarrow} A, \ c \in T(C) \}.$$

In this notation, since any point in D has stabilizer equal to $\{e\}$, (4.5) implies $w^*(a) = 0$. Consequently we have $\langle a \rangle (G/e) = 0$, and thus

$$(0) \subsetneq \langle a \rangle \subsetneq T,$$

which means $(0) \subseteq T$ is not maximal.

Second, we show (1) implies that $T(G/e)$ has no non-trivial ideal. Suppose $T(G/e)$ has a non-trivial ideal $0 \neq I \subsetneq T(G/e)$. By Proposition 2.14, there is an ideal $\mathscr{I}_I \subseteq T$ satisfying $\mathscr{I}_I(G/e) = I$. Thus $(0) \subseteq T$ is not a maximal ideal.

Conversely, we show (2) implies (1). It suffices to show, for any transitive $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$, any non-zero element $a \in T(X)$ satisfies $\langle a \rangle = T$.

Take any $\gamma \in {}_G set(G/e, X)$. By (MRC) we have $0 \neq \gamma^*(a) \in \langle a \rangle(G/e)$. Since $\langle a \rangle(G/e)$ is a G-invariant ideal of $T(G/e)$, this implies $\langle a \rangle(G/e) = T(G/e)$. By Proposition 2.13, it follows $\langle a \rangle = T$. □

Theorem 4.32 also can be shown using the following.

Remark 4.33. For any Tambara functor T, the set of maximal ideals of T is bijective to the set of G-invariant ideals of $T(G/e)$ maximal with respect to the inclusion.

Proof. This immediately follows from Proposition 2.14.

□

Example 4.34.

(1) If $\mathbb{F}$ is a G-ring where $\mathbb{F}$ is a field, then $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is field-like.
(2) If R is a G-ring where R is an integral domain, then $\mathcal{P}_R$ is domain-like.

However, even if T is field-like, $T(G/e)$ is not necessarily an integral domain as in the following example.

Example 4.35. Let $G = \mathfrak{S}_n$ be the n-th symmetric group. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field, and let R be the product of n-copies of $\mathbb{F}$, on which G acts by

$$\sigma \cdot (x_1, \ldots, x_n) = (x_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, x_{\sigma(n)}),$$

for any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in R$. Then $\mathcal{P}_R$ becomes a field-like Tambara functor by Theorem 4.32.

On the other hand, we have the following.

Remark 4.36. For any field-like Tambara functor T, the following holds.

(1) $T(G/e)^G$ is a field.
(2) $T(G/G)$ is a subfield of $T(G/e)^G$.

Proof. (1) For any G-invariant $x \in T(G/e)$, we have

$$\langle x \rangle(G/e) = \{rx \mid r \in T(G/e)\}$$

by Proposition 3.4. If $x \neq 0$, we have $\langle x \rangle(G/e) \ni 1$, and thus there exists some $r \in T(G/e)$ satisfying $rx = 1$.

(2) Remark that T satisfies (MRC), and $(p_e^G)^* \colon T(G/G) \hookrightarrow T(G/e)^G$ is injective. Since T is a Tambara subfunctor of $\mathcal{P}_{T(G/e)}$ by Proposition 4.21, we have

$$(p_e^G)_\bullet (p_e^G)^*(x) = x^{|G|} \tag{4.6}$$

for any $x \in T(G/e)$. Since $(p_e^G)^*(x)$ is G-invariant, it is invertible in $T(G/e)$ by (1) if $x \neq 0$. By (4.6), it follows that $x \neq 0$ is invertible in $T(G/G)$. □

In the rest, we show $\Omega\in\mathrm{Ob}(\mathit{Tam}(G))$ is a domain-like Tambara functor, for any finite group G.

We use the notation in Remark 4.26. Recall that for any transitive $X\cong G/H\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G\mathit{set})$, any $a\in\Omega(X)$ can be decomposed uniquely as

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{O}(H)} m_K\, G/K \qquad (m_K\in\mathbb{Z})\\ &= mX+\sum_{K\prec H} m_K\, G/K \qquad (m_K\in\mathbb{Z},\ m=m_H)\end{aligned}$$

in $\Omega(X)$. We denote this integer m by $\rho_X(a)$. This defines a ring homomorphism

$$\rho_X\colon \Omega(X)\to\mathbb{Z}.$$

Proposition 4.37. *Let $X\in\mathrm{Ob}({}_G\mathit{set})$ be transitive. For any $a\in\Omega(X)$, we have*

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a))=\rho_X(a).$$

Proof. We use the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.38. *Suppose $a=(A\xrightarrow{p}X)$ where A is a transitive G-set over X satisfying ${}_G\mathit{set}(X,A)=\emptyset$. Then we have*

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a))=0.$$

Lemma 4.39. *For any $a,b\in\Omega(X)$, we have*

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a+b))=\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a))+\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(b)).$$

Assume Lemma 4.38 and Lemma 4.39 are shown. Since

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(X))=\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(1))=1,$$

it follows

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(mX))=m \qquad ({}^\forall m\in\mathbb{Z})$$

by Lemma 4.39. Thus Proposition 4.37 hold for $a=mX$ $(m\in\mathbb{Z})$.

By Remark 4.26, for any $X\cong G/H$, any $a\in\Omega(X)$ is decomposed as

$$a=mX+\sum_{K\prec H} m_K\, G/K \qquad (m,m_K\in\mathbb{Z}).$$

Since ${}_G\mathit{set}(X,G/K)=\emptyset$ for any $K\prec H$, we have

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(G/K))=0$$

by Lemma 4.38.

Thus by Lemma 4.39, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a)) &= \rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(mX))+\sum_{K\prec H} m_K\,\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(G/K))\\ &= m,\end{aligned}$$

and thus Proposition 4.37 follows.

Thus it remains to show Lemma 4.38 and Lemma 4.39.

Proof of Lemma 4.38. By the definition of $(\mathrm{pt}_X)_!$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a) &= \Pi_{\mathrm{pt}_X}(A)\\ &= \{\sigma \mid \sigma\colon X \to A \text{ is a map of sets, } p \circ \sigma = \mathrm{id}_X\}.\end{aligned}$$

If there exists $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathrm{pt}_X}(A)$ such that $G_\sigma = G$, then it means σ is a G-map from X to A, which contradicts to ${}_G set(X, A) = \emptyset$. Thus any $\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathrm{pt}_X}(A)$ does not have stabilizer equal to G, and thus $\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a)) = 0$. ☐

Proof of Lemma 4.39. In the notation of Remark 1.4 (by letting $f = \mathrm{pt}_X$), we have

$$(\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a+b) = (\mathrm{pt}_X)_\bullet(a+b) = s_+(t_\bullet r^*(a) \cdot t'_\bullet r'^*(b)).$$

Remark that $V = G/G \times \{C \mid C \subseteq X\} = \{C \mid C \subseteq X\}$. Since X is transitive, $C \in V$ has stabilizer equal to G if and only if $C = \emptyset$ or $C = X$. Thus V decomposes as

$$V = V_{\mathfrak{e}} \amalg V_{\mathfrak{o}} \amalg V_{\mathfrak{t}},$$

where $V_{\mathfrak{e}} = \{\emptyset\}$, $V_{\mathfrak{t}} = \{X\}$, and $V_{\mathfrak{o}}$ is their complement $V_{\mathfrak{o}} = V \setminus (V_{\mathfrak{e}} \cup V_{\mathfrak{t}})$, which does not contain any point with stabilizer G.

Under the identification $\Omega(V) \cong \Omega(V_{\mathfrak{e}}) \times \Omega(V_{\mathfrak{o}}) \times \Omega(V_{\mathfrak{t}})$, we write any $v \in \Omega(V)$ as

$$v = (v_{\mathfrak{e}}, v_{\mathfrak{o}}, v_{\mathfrak{t}}),$$

where $v_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \Omega(V_{\mathfrak{e}})$, $v_{\mathfrak{o}} \in \Omega(V_{\mathfrak{o}})$, $v_{\mathfrak{t}} \in \Omega(V_{\mathfrak{t}})$. Looking at stabilizers, we can show

$$\rho_{G/G}(s_+(v)) = \rho_{V_{\mathfrak{e}}}(v_{\mathfrak{e}}) + \rho_{V_{\mathfrak{t}}}(v_{\mathfrak{t}}). \tag{4.7}$$

Since $t(U) = V_{\mathfrak{o}} \amalg V_{\mathfrak{t}}$ and $t'(U') = V_{\mathfrak{e}} \amalg V_{\mathfrak{o}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}t_\bullet r^*(a) &= (1, (t_\bullet r^*(a))_{\mathfrak{o}}, (t_\bullet r^*(a))_{\mathfrak{t}}),\\ t'_\bullet t'^*(b) &= ((t'_\bullet r'^*(b))_{\mathfrak{e}}, (t'_\bullet r'^*(b))_{\mathfrak{o}}, 1),\end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}t_\bullet r^*(0) &= (1,0,0),\\ t'_\bullet r'^*(0) &= (0,0,1).\end{aligned}$$

By (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a+b)) &= \rho_{G/G}(s_+(t_\bullet r^*(a) \cdot t'_\bullet r'^*(b)))\\ &= \rho_{V_{\mathfrak{e}}}((t'_\bullet r'^*(b))_{\mathfrak{e}}) + \rho_{V_{\mathfrak{t}}}((t_\bullet r^*(a))_{\mathfrak{t}}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Especially, if we let $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, then we obtain respectively

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(b)) = \rho_{V_{\mathfrak{e}}}(t'_\bullet r'^*(b)_{\mathfrak{e}}), \tag{4.9}$$

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a)) = \rho_{V_{\mathfrak{t}}}(t_\bullet r^*(a)_{\mathfrak{t}}). \tag{4.10}$$

By (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10), we obtain

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a+b)) = \rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(a)) + \rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_X)_!(b)).$$

☐

☐

Theorem 4.40. *For any finite group G, the Burnside Tambara functor Ω on G is domain-like.*

Proof. We use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.41. *For any transitive* $X \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ *and any non-zero* $a \in T(X)$, *there exist some transitive* $\widetilde{X}_a$ *and a* G*-map* $\nu_a \in {}_G set(\widetilde{X}_a, X)$ *such that*

$$\rho_{\widetilde{X}_a}(\nu_a^*(a)) \neq 0.$$

Suppose Lemma 4.41 is proven. Let $a \in T(X)$, $b \in T(Y)$ be arbitrary non-zero elements, with $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}({}_G set)$ transitive. By Lemma 4.41, there exist transitive $\widetilde{X}_a$, $\widetilde{Y}_b$ and $\nu_a \in {}_G set(\widetilde{X}_a, X)$, $\nu_b \in {}_G set(\widetilde{Y}_b, Y)$ such that

$$\rho_{\widetilde{X}_a}(\nu_a^*(a)) \neq 0, \quad \rho_{\widetilde{Y}_b}(\nu_b^*(b)) \neq 0.$$

By Proposition 4.37, we have

$$\rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_{\widetilde{X}_a})_! \nu_a^*(a)) \neq 0, \quad \rho_{G/G}((\mathrm{pt}_{\widetilde{Y}_b})_! \nu_b^*(b)) \neq 0.$$

Since $\rho_{G/G}$ is a ring homomorphism, it follows

$$\rho_{G/G}(\,((\mathrm{pt}_{\widetilde{X}_a})_! \nu_a^*(a)) \cdot ((\mathrm{pt}_{\widetilde{Y}_b})_! \nu_b^*(b))\,) \neq 0.$$

In particular $((\mathrm{pt}_{\widetilde{X}_a})_! \nu_a^*(a)) \cdot ((\mathrm{pt}_{\widetilde{Y}_b})_! \nu_b^*(b)) \neq 0$. By Corollary 4.30, this means Ω is domain-like.

Thus it remains to show Lemma 4.41.

Proof of Lemma 4.41. We may assume $X = G/H$ for some $H \leq G$. As in Remark 4.26, decompose a as

$$a = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{O}(H)} m_K \, G/K.$$

Remark that, for each $K, L \in \mathcal{O}(H)$, we have

$$\rho_{G/K}((p_K^H)^*(G/L)) \neq 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad K \preceq L.$$

Thus, if we take a maximal element K in the set associated to a

$$S_a = \{L \in \mathcal{O}(H) \mid m_L \neq 0\},$$

then this K satisfies

$$m_K \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad m_L = 0 \ \ (K \prec {}^{\forall} L \preceq H),$$

and we have

$$\rho_{G/K}((p_K^H)^*(a)) \neq 0$$

by the additivity of $(p_K^H)^*$ and $\rho_{G/K}$. □

□

As a corollary of arguments so far, we obtain a strict inclusion $\mathit{Spec}(\Omega(G/e)) \subsetneq \mathit{Spec}(\Omega)$ as follows. Combined with Theorem 4.40, we may conclude that the (prime) ideal theory discussed in this article is a more precise tool for a Tambara functor T, than the ordinary ideal theory for $T(G/e)$.

Corollary 4.42. *Let* G *be a finite group. The correspondence*

$$\mathscr{I}_{(-)} \colon \mathit{Spec}(\Omega(G/e)) = \mathit{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathit{Spec}(\Omega) \ ; \ \mathfrak{p} \mapsto \mathscr{I}_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

gives a strict inclusion $\mathit{Spec}(\Omega(G/e)) \subsetneq \mathit{Spec}(\Omega)$.

Proof. As in Remark 4.33, $\mathscr{I}_{(-)}$ sends maximal ideals of $\Omega(G/e)$ to maximal ideals of Ω bijectively. Besides, by Example 4.25 and Proposition 4.31, we see that $\mathscr{I}_{(0)} \subseteq \Omega$ is also prime.

Thus we obtain a map

$$\mathscr{I}_{(-)}\colon \mathit{Spec}(\Omega(G/e)) \rightarrow \mathit{Spec}(\Omega)\ ;\ \mathfrak{p} \mapsto \mathscr{I}_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

which is obviously injective.

Moreover, Theorem 4.40 means $(0) \subseteq \Omega$ is a prime ideal. Since Ω does not satisfy (MRC), this ideal is not of the form $\mathscr{I}_I$. $\square$

References

[1] Bley, W.; Boltje, R.: *Cohomological Mackey functors in number theory.* J. Number Theory **105** (2004) 1–37.

[2] S. Bouc.: *Green functors and G-sets.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1671, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1977).

[3] Nakaoka, H.: *Tambarization of a Mackey functor and its application to the Witt-Burnside construction.* arXiv:1010.0812.

[4] Nakaoka, H.: *A generalization of the Dress construction for a Tambara functor, and polynomial Tambara functors.* arXiv:1012.1911.

[5] Oda, F; Yoshida, T: *Crossed Burnside rings III: The Dress construction for a Tambara functor.* J. of Alg. **327** (2011) 31–49.

[6] Tambara, D.: *On multiplicative transfer.* Comm. Algebra **21** (1993), no. 4, 1393–1420.

[7] Tambara, D.: *Multiplicative transfer and Mackey functors.* manuscript.

[8] Thévenaz, J.: *Defect theory for maximal ideals and simple functors.* J. of Alg. **140** (1991) 426–483.

[9] Yoshida, T.: *Polynomial rings with coefficients in Tambara functors.* (Japanese) Sūrikaisekikenkyūsho Kōkyūroku No. 1466 (2006), 21–34.

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Kagoshima University, 1-21-35 Korimoto, Kagoshima, 890-0065 Japan

E-mail address: `nakaoka@sci.kagoshima-u.ac.jp`